

American SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

The Official Journal of the American Sociological Society

Volume 7

OCTOBER, 1942

Number 5

Contents

Age and Sex Categories	RALPH LINTON	589
Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States	TALCOTT PARSONS	604
The Adjustment of the Individual to his Age and Sex Roles	LEONARD S. COTTRELL, JR.	617
Community Roles in Attitude Formation	THEODORE M. NEWCOMB	621
Effect of the War Declaration on the National Morale of American College Students	DELBERT C. MILLER	631
Food and Culture in Southern Illinois—A Preliminary Report	JOHN W. BENNETT, HARVEY L. SMITH, AND HERBERT PASSIN	645
Sociology in American Colleges	RAYMOND KENNEDY AND RUBY JO REEVES KENNEDY	661
General Introductory Courses in the Social Sciences	LELAND C. DEVINNEY AND EARL S. JOHNSON	676
The Survey Course in Social Science: An Appraisal	JULIAN L. WOODWARD	681
Official Reports and Proceedings		694
Supplemental List of Members		697
Preliminary Program of the Thirty-Seventh Annual Meeting		698
Current Items		704
Book Reviews		707

(The above articles are indexed in the *International Index to Periodicals* and the *Bulletin of the Public Affairs Information Service*)

American SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

OFFICERS FOR THE YEAR 1942

President, DWIGHT SANDERSON, Cornell University

First Vice-President, HAROLD A. PHELPS, Univ. of Pittsburgh

Second Vice-President, KATHARINE JOCHER, Univ. of N. Carolina

Secretary-Treasurer, CONRAD TAEUBER, U. S. Dept. of Agri.

FORMER PRESIDENTS

E. A. ROSS, Univ. of Wisconsin

J. P. LICHTENBERGER, Univ. of Penn.

C. A. ELLWOOD, Duke Univ.

R. E. PARK, Fisk Univ.

J. L. GILLIN, Univ. of Wisconsin

W. I. THOMAS, Berkeley, Calif.

J. M. GILLETTE, Univ. of N. Dak.

W. F. OGBURN, Univ. of Chicago

H. W. ODUM, Univ. of N. C.

E. S. BOGARDUS, Univ. of S. Calif.

L. L. BERNARD, Washington Univ.

E. B. REUTER, State Univ. of Iowa

E. W. BURGESS, Univ. of Chicago

F. S. CHAPIN, Univ. of Minn.

H. P. FAIRCHILD, New York Univ.

E. FARIS, Univ. of Chicago

F. H. HANKINS, Smith College

E. H. SUTHERLAND, Indiana Univ.

S. A. QUEEN, Washington Univ.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

PRESIDENT, the two VICE-PRESIDENTS, and the last five former PRESIDENTS.

Elected at Large: R. S. LYND, Columbia Univ.; J. K. FOLSOM, Vassar College; HERBERT BLUMER, Univ. of Chicago; E. F. FRAZIER, Howard Univ.; J. O. HERTZLER, Univ. of Nebr.; R. B. VANCE, Univ. of N. C. *Elected from Affiliated Societies*: C. C. TAYLOR, Dist. of Columbia; N. E. HIMES, Eastern; C. W. HART, Mid-Western; C. R. HOFFER, Ohio Valley; P. H. LANDIS, Pacific; B. O. WILLIAMS, Rural; E. T. KRUEGER, Southern; W. H. SEWELL, South-western.

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

PRESIDENT, SECRETARY-TREASURER, EDITOR OF THE *Review*. *Elected by the Executive Committee*: STUART A. QUEEN, RUPERT B. VANCE, PAUL H. LANDIS.

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

The Official Journal of the American Sociological Society

EDITORIAL BOARD

DWIGHT SANDERSON
President

JOSEPH K. FOLSOM
Editor

CONRAD TAEUBER
Managing Editor

Assistant Editors

P. V. YOUNG

L. S. COTTRELL, JR.

T. L. SMITH

DONALD YOUNG

M. A. ELLIOTT

R. T. LAPIERE

Book Review Editors: LELAND C. DEVINNEY, THOMAS C. MCCORMICK
327 Sterling Hall, Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

The AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW is published at 450 Ahnaip Street, Menasha, Wisconsin, bi-monthly in February, April, June, August, October and December. Copyright 1942 by the American Sociological Society.

Membership dues of the Society, including subscription, are \$6.00 per Year. Subscription rates: non-members, \$4.00; libraries, \$3.00; students, \$2.50. Single issues, \$1.00. Postage is paid by the publishers in the United States, Canada, and other countries in the Pan-American Union; other countries in the Postal Union, fifty cents.

Address all business communications to the Managing Editor, U. S. Dept. of Agri., Washington, D. C. Changes of address must be requested at least one month in advance.

Address all editorial communications to the Editor, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. All unsolicited manuscripts must enclose return postage.

Address all matters pertaining to book reviews to Book Review Editors, 327 Sterling Hall, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Menasha, Wisconsin, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, embodied in paragraph 4, section 538, P.L. and R., authorized June 4, 1936.

American SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

Volume 7

OCTOBER, 1942

Number 5

AGE AND SEX CATEGORIES*

RALPH LINTON

Columbia University

Some points of interest. Do age groups have separate cultures? How the role of adolescence varies among different cultures. American adolescence as an extension of childhood. Marriage as a *rite de passage* as well as a union of persons. The significance of Confirmation, of the debut. Does old age really generally bring increased prestige? Do older women gain power as they graduate from chaperonage?[Ed.]

RECENT years have witnessed an increasing interest in the phenomena of social structure and a search for formulations which might prove useful as tools for research. In particular, the growing interest in problems of personality and culture has created a need for some system by which the positions of individuals within a social-cultural configuration can be clearly delimited. Any refinement of the present crude comparative methods of personality study has as prerequisite the development of techniques by which groups of individuals can be delimited in terms of community of social position and culture participation. The familiar institutional approaches to society and culture have proved inadequate for this since each institution corresponds to only a small segment of the individual's social-cultural participation. It seems that better formulations can be developed through an analysis of the various ways in which societies classify and organize their members and of the types of classification and organization which appear to be common to all social systems.

The first point revealed by such an analysis is that every society classifies and organizes its members in several different ways simultaneously. A discussion of these multiple systems of organization is beyond the scope of the present paper. Instead I propose to deal with only one aspect of social structure; the classification of a society's members on the basis of age and sex. For our present purposes these two characteristics may be treated as a unit since membership in a particular age-sex category, or in one of a

* Presented to the American Sociological Society, December 27, 1941, at New York City.

clearly delimited group of such categories, will be found to be a prerequisite for the occupation of practically any status within a given social system. This is most obviously the case with regard to occupational statuses. Nearly every skill included within a given culture will be found to have been assigned to the members of a particular age-sex category within the given society. Even new skills, after a brief period of uncertainty, became associated with such categories as part of the process of integration. However, even membership in associations and statuses within the family organization bear a very close relation to age-sex categories. Thus before a person can join even such an informal Association as a work or exchange group he must pass a lower age limit. Similarly, before an individual can assume the status of father in a new conjugal family unit he must belong to the adult/male category in the age-sex system.¹

With respect to positions which are less central to the family structure the factor of membership in particular age-sex categories is less obvious. Occupation of these positions is, of course, determined by other factors of real or assumed relationship. However, the culturally ascribed roles for such positions always assume that the holder will belong to a particular age-sex category. Note the impossibility of adhering to the formal roles for an uncle-nephew relationship when the uncle is a child and the nephew an adult.

It must be emphasized that the establishment of age-sex categories is a *classificatory* device. Such groupings need not and usually do not possess any internal structure. There may be a connection between category membership and membership in a particular Association, as when all the men of a particular age group form a dance society, but such a linkage is largely fortuitous. Even when it is prescribed by the culture pattern it will usually be found that the Association does not actually include all individuals of the particular category. In spite of the absence of structure, however, there seems to be a universal tendency for members of all the age-sex categories above the infant level to develop at least some sense of category solidarity, based upon community of knowledge and interest. With this is associated at least a rudimentary ability to act as a unit in cases where all members feel themselves threatened. The skill with which children or adolescents conceal certain details of the behavior of their contemporaries from adults would be a case in point. Both of these phenomena are undoubtedly associated with the tendency for certain culture patterns to be expressed and transmitted by the members of particular age-sex categories. This is an

¹ At this point the infinite variability of cultures operates to qualify even such a seemingly obvious generalization. There are some African groups in which a woman may assume the social status of a father. Even in such cases it must be an adult woman, i.e., occupation of this status has as a prerequisite membership in either one of two age-sex categories. See M. J. Herskovits, *Dahomey*, Vol. 1, pp. 319-322.

almost unexplored field which should, I believe, yield results of considerable practical as well as theoretical importance.

There are numerous primitive societies in which the adult male or adult female category arrogates to itself certain knowledge and certain patterns of ritual behavior which are transmitted to new individuals only at the time when they are initiated into the category. Even among ourselves adults normally withhold certain knowledge from children and adolescents. We are all familiar with the sudden lull in certain lively conversations when a child enters the room. However, we are prone to forget that the members of sub-adult categories also have their distinctive culture patterns which are not learned from adults. These patterns, like the secret knowledge of the adult, are transmitted to new individuals as they enter the category. Thus most children's games are not taught to the child by adults but by slightly older children. The same holds for the patterns of adolescent love making, at least in our society. These culture patterns of the sub-adult categories are relinquished by individuals as they pass to groupings which are higher in the age series and are, to a very large extent, forgotten. However, they may differ enough from the functionally equivalent patterns of the adult to produce acute embarrassment in him when he is reminded of them.

In spite of the close relation which age-sex categories bear to physiological facts, they are by no means divorced from cultural factors. The life of the individual is a continuum within which most physiological states undergo gradual and almost imperceptible change. The only clearly distinguishable datum points in this series are birth, the arrival of sexual maturity, the loss of reproductive powers and death. Even the datum points connected with sex and reproduction are accurately determinable only for females. Societies have, therefore, a considerable range of choice with respect both to the number of age-sex categories to be distinguished and to the points in the life cycle at which transitions from one category to another are supposed to take place. Curiously enough, this aspect of social organization has been largely overlooked by investigators of primitive societies. Although no ethnological report is considered complete unless it includes the native terms for all relatives to the most remote and least considered degrees, one will look in vain for similar lists of age-sex groups. Although such terms are not significant in themselves, they provide a sure clue to the type of age-sex differentiations recognized by the particular society and through this to the functions of the various categories relative to the society as a whole.

Although both age-sex category terms and relationship terms may reflect other factors than those of social function, it is safe to say that no age-sex grouping is likely to be terminologically differentiated for any long period after it has ceased to be functionally differentiated. Our own age-sex ter-

minology offers an interesting example of this. In rural England of the eighteenth century members of the adolescent group were distinguished by special terms, i.e. lad and lass, while the final periods in the male and female life cycle were also known by distinctive terms such as gaffer for old men and goody for old women. With the industrial revolution, especially the introduction of child labor, the adolescent category lost its distinctive functions and culture patterns and the terms associated with it dropped out of urban usage. They survive today only in rural districts and as conscious poetic archaisms. When, with the rise of modern social and psychological studies, this period in the individual life cycle again began to obtrude itself, it was designated by a new term, adolescence, which still has not achieved general popular usage. Even for scientists this new term carries physiological rather than sociological connotations. Similarly, industrialization brought important changes in the status of the old who, under earlier rural conditions, were accustomed to retire from active management of their property as soon as the eldest son had married and set up housekeeping in the family homestead. The time of retirement was no longer formalized and the period of old age became correspondingly indefinite in both its limits and social functions. This change was marked by the loss of the distinctive old age terms from urban usage with their replacement by the familiar adult category terms with the qualifying adjective "old" employed when needed for precision.

Although the lack of data makes generalizations with respect to patterns of age-sex classification somewhat hazardous, a few conclusions appear justified. Such classificatory systems are sufficiently divorced from physiological considerations to make possible almost any amplification of formal categories and almost any choice of transition points. Only birth and death are universally recognized as transition points and even these do not always set the limits of the individual's social participation. In many societies the unborn child becomes a part of the social configuration from the moment that pregnancy is recognized and is guarded by elaborate taboos incumbent upon one or both parents. The Chinese custom of reckoning the age of an individual from the time of conception rather than that of birth is a good example of this attitude. Conversely, as has been repeatedly pointed out, there are numerous societies in which the fact of birth does not make the child a part of society. Participation comes only with some ceremony of formal recognition, as when the Roman father took his child into his arms.

The significance of death relative to membership in the society is equally variable. Even in those societies which do not believe in ancestral spirits, separation of the individual from the society normally comes, not with death but with the termination of the funeral rites. Where there is a strong belief in ancestral spirits, death may be regarded merely as a point of cate-

gory transition, comparable in its social significance to marriage. Thus for the Malagasy the dead are as much members of the society as the living and are regarded as almost equally active participants in their families' activities.

If we turn from such terminal categories to the age-sex groupings differentiated within what we consider the authentic life cycle, we still find a wide range of variation between different societies. Thus the Inca of Peru distinguished ten age groupings for males alone. This unparalleled subdivision of the life cycle seems to have been primarily an administrative device and the round number probably reflected the decimal mindedness which permeated the organization of their empire. It is impossible to tell at the present time in how far these categories were differentiated with respect to anything but tax rolls and obligations of service, and membership in some of them was certainly of brief duration. Apparently the female life cycle was less minutely subdivided.

In the light of our very limited information, it seems that there is a tendency to distinguish more male than female age groups, possibly as a reflection of the generally greater prestige and social importance of men in primitive societies. There also seems to be little correlation between the ages at which category transitions occur in the male and in the female series except that the female transition to the adult category tends to occur at a somewhat earlier age than the male transition. Although there is an obvious physiological explanation for this, other factors may very well be involved. The role of the adult male as provider and family head would normally require a greater degree of maturity and experience than the role of wife. It should also be pointed out that even in females the readily discernible onset of sexual maturity is by no means always a signal for induction into the adult category. Even in societies which do not recognize a distinct category of adolescents, the transfer of a female from child to adult status is frequently delayed until the birth of her first child.

In spite of the wide range of variation in the delimitation of age and sex categories, there is a minimum of seven groupings which appear to be basic to all systems of age-sex classification. These are:—Infant, boy, girl, adult man, adult woman, old man, old woman. Even in these primary differentiations cultural as well as physiological factors are recognizable. Cultural factors are least important in connection with the infant category, which is established primarily by the infant's helplessness and complete dependence upon adults. Sex differences are of little importance at this stage, a fact reflected in most age-sex terminologies. Nearly all languages seem to have a single asexual term for infant, corresponding to our own "baby." Although there may be special terms for male and female infants, the general terms is ordinarily the one in most common usage.

At all the higher levels in the age-sex series terminological differentiation by sex seems to be practically universal. However, such distinctions seem

to be determined quite as much by cultural as by biological factors. Thus pre-pubertal boys and girls differ little if at all in their physiologically determined potentialities for work or social participation. The primary reason that they are distinguished in all classificatory systems is that, from the end of infancy if not before, they are subjected to special training designed to fit them for their divergent roles as adults. The differentiation of the child categories thus looks forward to the very real physiological as well as cultural differentiation of the sexes which will come with maturity.

A somewhat comparable situation exists with respect to the aged. Here again the physiologically determined potentialities of males and females are much the same, in fact old women are often stronger and more active than men in the corresponding age bracket. However, the members of each sex have been shaped to a different pattern by their childhood training and adult experience. Their physiological equivalence is reflected, if at all, in the removal of many of the social and especially ceremonial disabilities to which adult women are subject. Thus old women are almost universally exempted from seclusion and chaperonage. They also tend to be allowed much more power than young women. Even in societies which are strongly patriarchal in theory it will be found that a surprisingly large number of families are ruled by strong willed mothers or grandmothers. Lastly, a very large proportion of the societies which exclude adult women from participation in religious ceremonies and contact with sacred objects remove such restrictions after the menopause. To cite a single example, the Comanche excluded adult women from contact with "medicine" objects and from the practice of supernaturalistic healing, and thought that it was impossible for them to acquire "power." Old women, on the other hand, could acquire and use "power" on exactly the same terms as men and were treated as equals by male "power" holders. It was even a common practice in this tribe for medicine men to train their wives in the techniques of healing when they had reached middle age, transferring their own powers to them immediately after the menopause so that, if they were widowed, they could still carry on the husband's practice.

As regards the adult categories, differentiation by sex is clearly indicated on both physiological and cultural grounds. These categories are everywhere associated with the clearest differentiation in cultural participation. It is always their members which form the mainstay of a society and which exercise its culture patterns in most complete form. These categories represent the high point in the individual's existence. The social roles of members of the younger categories are organized mainly in terms of preparation for membership in them while the roles of the aged look back to and derive from them.

Although the seven categories just discussed are basic to all systems of age-sex classification, most societies seem to amplify the series at one point

or another. Although material for really satisfactory comparative studies is still lacking, it seems that amplifications are most frequent in connection with the child categories, least frequent in connection with the adult ones. If these generalizations are correct, this probably reflects the longer duration of the adult period and the slow and barely perceptible nature of the physiological changes which take place within it.

One of the most interesting problems in connection with age-sex classifications is that of the social treatment of adolescence. By no means all societies have a separate term for this period or accord it recognition in their social structure. This is the more suprising since there is increasing evidence that this period in the life cycle is a distinctive one, having its own physiological characteristics. The work of Mills,² Ashley-Montague³ and others has shown that in the case of females, and presumably of males also, there is an interval between the onset of sexual maturity and the appearance of reproductive maturity; a sterile period which may last for as much as three years. Nature thus provided our species with an interval for courting and for sexual experimentation unhampered by the threat of offspring and the social responsibilities which these entail. During this period the function of sex is primarily one of pleasure. The awakened or, Freudianly speaking, reawakened sexual interests of the individual become, in interaction with the situation created by the universal occurrence of incest taboos, a lever for detaching the individual from his previous close association with parents and siblings. They help to overcome the emotional dependence on members of his own family group which has been developed in the course of his childhood experience, encourage him to new experiments in personal relationships and prepare him psychologically for his adult role as a nuclear member of a new conjugal family unit.

In view of the importance of this period to the individual's personality development and successful social adjustment as an adult, it seems curious that not all societies have accorded it formal recognition in their age-sex systems. Informal recognition is, of course, forced upon all societies by the behavior of the adolescents themselves. However, societies have a choice as to whether they will accept the fact of adolescence and turn the potentialities of this period to social advantage by incorporating adolescents into their structure as a distinct category, or whether they will refuse to recognize it. Thus in Polynesia adolescents are sharply differentiated from both children and adults. They are relieved of most social and economic responsibilities and left free to pursue their courting and tasks of personal adjustment. Their primary social functions are those of providing amuse-

² C. A. Mills and Cordelia Ogle, *Physiologic Sterility of Adolescence* (*Human Biology*, 8, 1936), pp. 607-615.

³ M. Ashley-Montague, *Coming Into Being among the Australian Aborigines*, 1937, pp. 237-253.

ment, by their organized dancing and singing, for the age groups above and below their own, and of cementing the friendly relations between villages by their reciprocal group visits. Although after such a period the responsibilities of adult life may be assumed with some reluctance, at least there is something to remember. Trends toward the development of a somewhat similar system are to be seen in at least the upper classes of our own society. The social roles of undergraduates in a coeducational university have much in common with those of the Polynesian *Kaioi*. However, the recognition of adolescents as a distinct category and the cultural delimitation of their social functions and of appropriate adult attitudes toward them are still things of the future.

In the societies which refuse to give formal recognition to adolescence, the denial may take either one of two forms. The child status with its patterns of submission and dependence may be extended upward to include the adolescent period, or the adult status with its multitude of social obligations may be extended downward to include it. A good example of the first is afforded by those societies in which young persons, girls more frequently than boys, are kept in a state of dependence and under rigid parental control until the time of marriage. Its results can be studied at first hand in many parts of continental Europe and still more in the Islamic civilizations where rigid parental control extends to sons as well as daughters. Examples of the second can be seen in those societies where the child is expected to assume adult responsibilities, including economic obligations and competition for adult goals, from the moment of puberty. This situation can be observed in some of the lower levels of our own society. Under either of these systems the adolescent who manifests the behavior congenial to his actual condition is regarded by adults as an aberrant and his treatment by them depends on whether they think of him as an aberrant child or an aberrant adult. In the former case he is to be disciplined and repressed, in the latter he receives censure for shiftlessness and irresponsibility and for his failure to achieve adult goals. The effects of these three systems for dealing with adolescents as they are reflected in adult personality provide a significant field for research. Both of the systems which ignore the special qualities of adolescents must impose serious frustrations, but these frustrations are of quite different sorts and should have different effects on the individual.

Whatever the system of age classification employed by a particular society it will be found that the categories which it establishes are ranked in a prestige series. The term prestige is here taken to mean social influence, not the degree of care or attention received. Thus infants and very young children receive more attention than older ones since they cannot survive without it, but they still stand at the bottom of the prestige scale. In general, the prestige order of the age groups is clearly defined for each sex but the ranking of particular categories in one sex series relative to those in

the other is difficult to establish. Even when there are social pronouncements on this point the arrangement varies greatly in different societies. Thus in strongly patriarchal societies any male, even an infant, may be said to rank any female. In even the most strongly matriarchal societies, on the other hand, I have been unable to find any case in which any female is presumed to rank any male. The commonest situation appears to be one in which adults, irrespective of sex, rank all members of the sub-adult age groups.

Within single sex series it seems to be an almost universal rule that the prestige order of the age categories below the adult level corresponds to their order in the individual life cycle. The most important variations between systems are those which occur in the relative ratings of adults and aged. There are certain societies in which adult status is, theoretically as well as actually, the high point in the life cycle, loss of physical powers being attended by immediate loss of prestige. In others the prestige of the individual theoretically increases steadily with age. How far it actually does so is another question which will be taken up later. In a few ancestor worshipping societies this trend is carried to its logical conclusion. The aged eventually become spirits, wielding more power over their descendents than they had when alive. It is interesting in this connection that the individuals who are singled out and treated as such in ancestor cults are, almost without exception, those who have died in old or at least middle age, i.e. have passed through all the age groups up to the final one. The spirits of children and adolescents, if remembered at all, rarely are treated as individuals.

Whatever a given society's system of age-sex categories may be, the individual's transfer from certain of these categories to those next in the age series is usually marked by ceremonial observances. However, all the transitions within any system are rarely commemorated in this way. The one transition which is well nigh universally ritualized is that of entry into the adult group. In most societies full membership in this category comes with marriage, not, as is frequently assumed, with puberty. The marriage ceremony, like most rituals, has multiple functions. It not only marks the founding of a new conjugal family unit and the establishment of new relationships between the relatives of the parties immediately involved, but it is also a rite de passage relative to the age-sex system. A first marriage transfers the participants from the child or adolescent to the adult category. The importance of this among the other functions of the marriage ceremony is illustrated by the frequency with which remarriages are given slight or even no ceremonial accompaniment. Such marriages are quite as important as first ones in terms of the new relationships established, but they are no longer rite de passage and do not entail the changes in culture participation which accompany transfer from one age-sex category to another.

Although the above generalization regarding the significance of the

marriage ceremony holds good for the great majority of societies, there are the usual exceptions to be noted. Thus the ceremony in child marriage obviously does not transfer the participants to adult status. At most it transfers the child wife to the guardianship of the child husband's family. It also appears that the significance of marriage as a *rite de passage* is present more frequently for males than for females. Except in the case of child marriage a first wedding always promotes a man to full adult status, but there are a number of societies in which women are promoted only with the birth of a first child. In such societies a barren woman is not considered an adult and is referred to by the terms used for members of the child or adolescent categories. It would be interesting to know whether such usages are linked with any relaxation of such women's obligations as adults, but information is lacking.

2 Less frequent than marriage rites, but nevertheless with a high incidence, are ceremonial observances at the transfer of the individual from the child to the adolescent categories. These have been noted for many societies and often have a spectacular quality which endears them to collectors of cultural curiosia. It should be stressed that such puberty ceremonies mark a transfer to the adolescent, not the adult, category. Full admission to the latter comes only with marriage or parenthood. The confusion on this point is due to the frequency with which adult responsibilities, other than those associated with the establishment of a new conjugal unit, are projected downward upon members of the adolescent category. The rites at marriage and at puberty differ from those which appear sporadically at other transition points in that they frequently include tests of the individual's ability to function successfully as a member of the new category. Such tests are a more frequent accompaniment of puberty than of marriage rites. Boys in particular are often subjected to very severe hazing before their admission to adolescent status while girls during the time of their first menstruation are often expected to work unusually hard at women's tasks. The latter regulation may be construed as a test of industry although more frequently rationalized as a magical means for assuring success in such tasks in later life. In marriage newly wed wives or husbands are frequently required to show their skill as housekeepers or providers before the union is given final recognition.

3 Still less frequent than marriage and puberty rites are ceremonial observances marking the individual's transfer from infant to child status, or from one group to another within the general child age level, when this is subdivided. It also seems that when such rites do occur they tend to be simpler and more familial than those marking later transitions. However, in societies in which children are used as an excuse for ostentation in connection with competitions for prestige they may become elaborate public affairs. Also, in societies having strong patterns of primogeniture, the early category transfers of an eldest child may be accompanied by elaborate

rituals while those of younger children receive little or no attention.

The transfer from adult to aged status is the one which receives least frequent ritual recognition. I have been unable to find a single society in which there are ceremonial observances in connection with the onset of the menopause, although the physiological indications of the change are almost as clear here as at puberty. The removal of social and ritual disabilities which frequently comes with this event has already been mentioned, but otherwise the change seems to be given no formal recognition. In males the waning of reproductive powers is so gradual that no transfer point is clearly indicated, but there are a few societies in which there are what might be termed ceremonies of retirement. In these a man invests his heir with the powers he formerly exercised or gives up some of the regular adult male prerogatives. Thus among the Comanche a man who had become too old for active participation in war was expected to surrender his "medicines" and after this was eligible for the post of Peace Chief.

These varying frequencies of *rites de passage* present certain problems which deserve further investigation. It is evident that there must be a number of factors involved, both psychological and cultural. Thus in all societies the individual builds up to full adult status gladly, anticipating each step in the ascending series. The increased obligations of adult life are more than compensated for by its added prestige and fuller social participation. The transitions in this part of the life cycle are milestones whose passage is to be emphasized. The passage from adult to old status, on the other hand, is awaited with regret. It is made reluctantly and with no eagerness for publicity. Even the respect and power which certain societies accord the aged are, at best, a consolation prize which does not compensate for a consciousness of waning strength and increasing physical disabilities.

Important as these psychological factors presumably are, they must be secondary to cultural ones in determining the points of incidence of *rites de passage* for various societies and the degree to which such rites are developed and elaborated. With regard to the latter there can be no doubt that certain societies have stronger tendencies toward ritualization than others, although the reasons for this are poorly understood and must be varied. Thus a society may have patterns of prestige competition through ostentatious waste which leads it to seize on every distinctive event in the individual's life as an occasion for public ceremony. Again, it may develop a feeling of dependence upon supernatural powers which will lead it to invoke them at every change in the individual's social position, or a feeling for the continuity of family lines which will make it eager to celebrate each step in the individual's development to the point where he can assist in perpetuating them. All these factors might operate either singly or in combination to produce an elaboration of *rites de passage* and their influence would scarcely be identical for any two cultures.

Why societies have selected certain transition points in the age-sex series

for ritual emphasis and ignored others, or why they have developed more elaborate rituals at certain points than at others, present problems of a different sort. It appears, in the light of our present fragmentary knowledge, that ritual emphasis and elaboration are most frequent at those points in the age-sex series where (a) the transfer from one category to another entails the greatest changes in the individual's culture participation and (b) where the changes are most abrupt. These points will, of course, differ from one society to another, but this does not invalidate the generalization. A few examples may make this point clear.

Many investigators have been struck by the absence of puberty rites in Polynesia, an absence which is high-lighted by the contrast with the neighboring Melanesian area and by the sexual emphases of Polynesian culture. It would seem that here, if anywhere, the arrival of sexual maturity would be commemorated. However, a study of the individual life cycle in any Polynesian culture will show a very gradual transition from child to adolescent status. Although the roles of the child and adolescent differ considerably, especially as regards responsibility in the family group and submission to parental control, the independent, carefree adolescent role is assumed gradually as the child becomes older and spends more and more time with contemporaries. Between the adolescent and adult roles, on the other hand, the transition is abrupt; the assumption of adult responsibilities, adult skills and labor coming with or in immediate preparation for marriage and the establishment of a new household. It is about marriage, therefore, that ritual might be expected to center and indeed such is the case. No other event in the individual's life cycle, not even death, is accompanied by such elaborate ceremonial.

In Melanesia, insofar as one can generalize about such a complex area, the conditions appear to be reversed. Here the transition from child to adolescent status makes a sharp change in culturally ascribed behavior, especially for males. The adolescent boy is isolated from his family and has to sleep in the men's house or where he can find shelter with mistresses. He assumes the financial obligations of an adult, participates in adult male activities and becomes involved in the all-pervading net of magical practices from which, as a child, he has been largely immune. After such a transition marriage is, in many respects, an anti-climax. Here we find that the most elaborate ritual observances center about the transition from childhood to adolescence, marriage being distinctly secondary in ceremonial importance.

In our own society there appears to be a progressive degeneration of *rites de passage*. This is presumably linked in part with the trend away from ceremonialism which began with the rise of Protestantism and the Industrial Revolution. However, it is significant that puberty ceremonies have deteriorated much more than marriage ceremonies. Marriage still marks a very definite and abrupt status transition. Puberty, on the other hand,

has lost much of its social significance and involves very little change in the culturally patterned behavior of the individual. The blurring of the division between the child and adolescent groups, although present throughout our society, depends upon different developments at different social levels. Until the recent enactment of child labor legislation, children in families at the lower levels of our economic structure were called upon to become wage earners and contributors to the family upkeep before they reached puberty and to continue in this role until they assumed full adult status with marriage and the establishment of a new family group. Conversely, in the professional groups adolescence has become merely a continuation of child status. The adolescent is still undergoing training for his adult role with an economic dependence upon his parents which perpetuates the submissive role of childhood. The tendency to fuse childhood and adolescence has probably been stimulated, at least at the higher social levels, by an increasing reticence in sexual matters and an insistence on sexual abstinence for adolescents. It is interesting that puberty rites, although no longer phrased as such or accurately correlated with the onset of sexual maturity, survive in greatest strength among the Catholic members of the lower economic group and in the highest bracket of the upper economic group. The former, who are notably conservative, still regard Confirmation as a significant transition point in the life cycle and give it extensive ritual emphasis. The latter have developed, in the debut, a female puberty rite which finds its main functions in connection with ostentatious waste and prestige competition.

The abruptness of the transition from one age category to another and the differences in the roles ascribed to members of successive categories are also of considerable interest to students of personality. In every society the individual must, in the course of his life cycle, perform many different roles a considerable portion of which are prescribed for him on the basis of his age-sex category membership. The behavior expected of him at one period in his life cycle is often sharply differentiated from that expected at another period and would seem to require, for its successful performance, a markedly different personality configuration. Nevertheless, we know that the average individual in all societies is able to make the transition from one age category role to another without serious personality disturbances and to function successfully in roles which often appear quite incompatible. This fact raises questions with regard to the structure of the personality and the dynamics of personality formation and functioning which it is impossible to answer at present. However, we have in the wide range of existing societies and cultures a mass of material which should contribute greatly to their solution.

Various societies differ profoundly in their demands for individual re-orientation in the course of the life cycle, but all of them make such de-

mands. The main differences seem to lie in the abruptness of the reorientations required and the ages at which they are expected to occur. To use a not too accurate simile, the life cycle in some societies might be likened to a cord which thickens at certain points but which does so gradually, with no clear lines of demarkation along its length. In others it is more nearly comparable to a string of beads, each period being set off sharply from those that precede and follow it. These similes would apply to the extreme ends of the variational range. More commonly, there are certain adjoining age categories whose roles blend into each other, others whose roles are sharply differentiated. Thus in our own society, the changing roles of females from infancy to marriage show no point of sudden differentiation but an abrupt transition comes with marriage and the new responsibilities of wife and mother. For males in the higher social levels, a similar transition comes when the individual leaves the sheltered environment of college and embarks in the cut-throat competition of modern business.

It seems that, in general, the more gradual the transitions between age categories the less the difficulties of the individual in assuming the new roles. The assumption of these roles is, after all, a matter of reconditioning. This, as plenty of animal experiments have shown, can be accomplished either by the repeated application of gentle stimuli or the sudden application of violent ones. There can be no question that the former process is much more comfortable for the subject, but both methods arrive at the same result. Some societies have chosen to apply one technique and some the other. It remains to be seen whether these two techniques produce different or lasting effects on the personalities of the individuals subjected to them. On this point we still have no information. It would also be interesting to know whether the results differ with the age at which each technique is applied. Contemporary "primitive" cultures offer a wealth of data on these points, but it remains to be collected and analyzed.

It should be emphasized that in all societies the stimuli employed for the reconditioning of individuals to successive age category roles involve a combination of rewards and punishments. The punishment for clinging to the role of a lower age category is easy enough to observe in all societies. It comes in the form of ridicule and ostracism by members of one's own age group. The rewards are less obvious, but in general it will be found that the increasing obligations which come with entry into the higher age categories are compensated for by increased authority and opportunities for ego satisfaction. This holds in particular for the categories up to and including that of full adult.

The transition from adulthood to old age is a more difficult one. Although certain societies ease this transition by the formal ascription to the aged of a respect and authority greater than that accorded to full adults, it is an open question how far these formal patterns agree with the actual practice.

It seems that even in the so-called gerontocracies age alone does not increase the individual's prestige. The man who has shown ability and exercised power as an adult may find his prestige enhanced with age, as may the woman who has borne many children and reared them successfully, but the ineffective adult remains quite as socially ineffective at the aged level. In general, the main incentive for growing old gracefully seems to be the gradual removal of many adult obligations. Whether this compensates for the loss of power which inevitably accompanies aging seems to depend upon individual personality. Thus in our own society we are all familiar with the individual who looks forward gladly to retirement and the individual who holds on to his responsibilities, and power, to the bitter end. Even commoner, and much more interesting from the psychological point of view, is the man who looks forward to retirement but finds, after it has taken place, that the removal of responsibilities does not compensate for the loss of power.

It is impossible in a paper of this length to do more than draw attention to a few of the outstanding problems in connection with the classification of individuals by age and sex and I realize that in the course of it I have raised more questions than I have answered. The main purpose of this discussion is to draw the attention of investigators to a new field for research in social structure; one which has important implications not only for the sociologist and ethnologist but also for the personality psychologist.

AGE AND SEX IN THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF THE UNITED STATES*

TALCOTT PARSONS

Harvard University

Points of interest. Male, female, and youth cultures in our society. Significance of the "swell guy" and "glamor girl." The isolation of old age in America. German versus American youth cultures. Adult male specialization versus the "common human" values of youth. The domestic, the glamorous, and the good-companion roles of women. Are sex roles becoming more alike or unlike? Sex roles and the difficulty of maintaining companionship in modern marriage. [Ed.]

IN OUR society age grading does not to any great extent, except for the educational system, involve formal age categorization, but is interwoven with other structural elements. In relation to these, however, it constitutes an important connecting link and organizing point of reference in many respects. The most important of these for present purposes are kinship structure, formal education, occupation and community participation. In most cases the age lines are not rigidly specific, but approximate; this does not, however, necessarily lessen their structural significance.¹

In all societies the initial status of every normal individual is that of child in a given kinship unit. In our society, however, this universal starting point is used in distinctive ways. Although in early childhood the sexes are not usually sharply differentiated, in many kinship systems a relatively sharp segregation of children begins very early. Our own society is conspicuous

* The substance of this paper was presented to the American Sociological Society on December 27, 1941, at New York City.

The attempt to embark on this analysis was suggested to the writer largely by Professor Ralph Linton, through his paper, "A Neglected Aspect of Social Structure," *American Journal of Sociology*, May, 1940, and through personal conversation. Both the general analytical significance of age and sex categories in social structure, and the main outline of the cultural variability of particular modes of organization of age and sex roles are taken for granted in the present paper. Professor Linton has amplified his treatment of these subjects in the preceding article in this issue of the *Review*.

The present paper will not embody the results of systematic research but constitutes rather a tentative statement of certain major aspects of the role of age and sex in our society and of their bearing on a variety of problems. It will not attempt to treat adequately the important variations according to social class, rural-urban differences, and so on, but will concentrate particularly on the urban middle and upper middle classes.

¹ The problem of organization of this material for systematic presentation is, in view of this fact, particularly difficult. It would be possible to discuss the subject in terms of the above four principal structures with which age and sex are most closely interwoven, but there are serious disadvantages involved in this procedure. Age and sex categories constitute one of the main links of structural continuity in terms of which structures which are differentiated in other respects are articulated with each other; and in isolating the treatment of these categories there is danger that this extremely important aspect of the problem will be lost sight of. The least objectionable method, at least within the limits of space of such a paper, seems to be to follow the sequence of the life cycle.

for the extent to which children of both sexes are in many fundamental respects treated alike. This is particularly true of both privileges and responsibilities. The primary distinctions within the group of dependent siblings are those of age. Birth order as such is notably neglected as a basis of discrimination; a child, of eight and a child of five have essentially the privileges and responsibilities appropriate to their respective age levels without regard to what older, intermediate, or younger siblings there may be. The preferential treatment of an older child is not to any significant extent differentiated if and because he happens to be the first born.

There are, of course, important sex differences in dress and in approved play interest and the like, but if anything, it may be surmised that in the urban upper middle classes these are tending to diminish. Thus, for instance, play overalls are essentially similar for both sexes. What is perhaps the most important sex discrimination is more than anything else a reflection of the differentiation of adult sex roles. It seems to be a definite fact that girls are more apt to be relatively docile, to conform in general according to adult expectations, to be "good," whereas boys are more apt to be recalcitrant to discipline and defiant of adult authority and expectations. There is really no feminine equivalent of the expression "bad boy." It may be suggested that this is at least partially explained by the fact that it is possible from an early age to initiate girls directly into many important aspects of the adult feminine role. Their mothers are continually about the house and the meaning of many of the things they are doing is relatively tangible and easily understandable to a child. It is also possible for the daughter to participate actively and usefully in many of these activities. Especially in the urban middle classes, however, the father does not work in the home and his son is not able to observe his work or to participate in it from an early age. Furthermore many of the masculine functions are of a relatively abstract and intangible character, such that their meaning must remain almost wholly inaccessible to a child. This leaves the boy without a tangible meaningful model to emulate and without the possibility of a gradual initiation into the activities of the adult male role. An important verification of this analysis could be provided through the study in our own society of the rural situation. It is my impression that farm boys tend to be "good" in a sense in which that is not typical of their urban brothers.

The equality of privileges and responsibilities, graded only by age but not by birth order, is extended to a certain degree throughout the whole range of the life cycle. In full adult status, however, it is seriously modified by the asymmetrical relation of the sexes to the occupational structure. One of the most conspicuous expressions and symbols of the underlying equality, however, is the lack of sex differentiation in the process of formal education, so far, at least, as it is not explicitly vocational. Up through college differentiation seems to be primarily a matter on the one hand of individual

ability, on the other hand of class status, and only to a secondary degree of sex differentiation. One can certainly speak of a strongly established pattern that all children of the family have a "right" to a good education, rights which are graduated according to the class status of the family but also to individual ability. It is only in post-graduate professional education, with its direct connection with future occupational careers, that sex discrimination becomes conspicuous. It is particularly important that this equality of treatment exists in the sphere of liberal education since throughout the social structure of our society there is a strong tendency to segregate the occupational sphere from one in which certain more generally human patterns and values are dominant, particularly in informal social life and the realm of what will here be called community participation.

Although this pattern of equality of treatment is present in certain fundamental respects at all age levels, at the transition from childhood to adolescence new features appear which disturb the symmetry of sex roles while still a second set of factors appears with marriage and the acquisition of full adult status and responsibilities.

An indication of the change is the practice of chaperonage, through which girls are given a kind of protection and supervision by adults to which boys of the same age group are not subjected. Boys, that is, are chaperoned only in their relations with girls of their own class. This modification of equality of treatment has been extended to the control of the private lives of women students in boarding schools and colleges. Of undoubted significance is the fact that it has been rapidly declining not only in actual effectiveness but as an ideal pattern. Its prominence in our recent past, however, is an important manifestation of the importance of sex role differentiation. Important light might be thrown upon its functions by systematic comparison with the related phenomena in Latin countries where this type of asymmetry has been far more sharply accentuated than in this country in the more modern period.

It is at the point of emergence into adolescence that there first begins to develop a set of patterns and behavior phenomena which involve a highly complex combination of age grading and sex role elements. These may be referred to together as the phenomena of the "youth culture." Certain of its elements are present in pre-adolescence and others in the adult culture. But the peculiar combination in connection with this particular age level is unique and highly distinctive for American society.

Perhaps the best single point of reference for characterizing the youth culture lies in its contrast with the dominant pattern of the adult male role. By contrast with the emphasis on responsibility in this role, the orientation of the youth culture is more or less specifically irresponsible. One of its dominant notes is "having a good time" in relation to which there is a particularly strong emphasis on social activities in company with the opposite

sex. A second predominant characteristic on the male side lies in the prominence of athletics, which is an avenue of achievement and competition which stands in sharp contrast to the primary standards of adult achievement in professional and executive capacities. Negatively, there is a strong tendency to repudiate interest in adult things and to feel at least a certain recalcitrance to the pressure of adult expectations and discipline. In addition to, but including, athletic prowess the typical pattern of the male youth culture seems to lay emphasis on the value of certain qualities of attractiveness, especially in relation to the opposite sex. It is very definitely a rounded humanistic pattern rather than one of competence in the performance of specified functions. Such stereotypes as the "swell guy" are significant of this. On the feminine side there is correspondingly a strong tendency to accentuate sexual attractiveness in terms of various versions of what may be called the "glamor girl" pattern.² Although these patterns defining roles tend to polarize sexually—for instance, as between star athlete and socially popular girl—yet on a certain level they are complementary, both emphasizing certain features of a total personality in terms of the direct expression of certain values rather than of instrumental significance.

One further feature of this situation is the extent to which it is crystallized about the system of formal education.³ One might say that the principal centers of prestige dissemination are the colleges, but that many of the most distinctive phenomena are to be found in high schools throughout the country. It is of course of great importance that liberal education is not primarily a matter of vocational training in the United States. The individual status

² Perhaps the most dramatic manifestation of this tendency lies in the prominence of the patterns of "dating," for instance among college women. As shown by an unpublished participant-observer study made at one of the Eastern Women's colleges, perhaps the most important single basis of informal prestige rating among the residents of a dormitory lies in their relative dating success—though this is by no means the only basis. One of the most striking features of the pattern is the high publicity given to the "achievements" of the individual in a sphere where traditionally in the culture a rather high level of privacy is sanctioned—it is interesting that once an engagement has occurred a far greater amount of privacy is granted. The standards of rating cannot be said to be well integrated, though there is an underlying consistency in that being in demand by what the group regards as desirable men is perhaps the main standard.

It is true that the "dating" complex need not be exclusively bound up with the "glamor girl" stereotype of ideal feminine personality—the "good companion" type may also have a place. Precisely, however, where the competitive aspect of dating is most prominent the glamor pattern seems heavily to predominate, as does, on the masculine side, a somewhat comparable glamorous type. On each side at the same time there is room for considerable difference as to just where the emphasis is placed—for example as between "voluptuous" sexual-ity and more decorous "charm."

³ A central aspect of this focus of crystallization lies in the element of tension, sometimes of direct conflict, between the youth culture patterns of college and school life, and the "serious" interests in and obligations toward curricular work. It is of course the latter which defines some at least of the most important foci of adult expectations of doing "good" work and justifying the privileges granted. It is not possible here to attempt to analyze the interesting, ambivalent attitudes of youth toward curricular work and achievement.

on the curricular side of formal education is, however, in fundamental ways linked up with adult expectations, and doing "good work" is one of the most important sources of parental approval. Because of secondary institutionalization this approval is extended into various spheres distinctive of the youth culture. But it is notable that the youth culture has a strong tendency to develop in directions which are either on the borderline of parental approval or beyond the pale, in such matters as sex behavior, drinking and various forms of frivolous and irresponsible behavior. The fact that adults have attitudes to these things which are often deeply ambivalent and that on such occasions as college reunions they may outdo the younger generation, as, for instance, in drinking, is of great significance, but probably structurally secondary to the youth-versus-adult differential aspect. Thus the youth culture is not only, as is true of the curricular aspect of formal education, a matter of age status as such but also shows strong signs of being a product of tensions in the relationship of younger people and adults.

From the point of view of age grading perhaps the most notable fact about this situation is the existence of definite pattern distinctions from the periods coming both before and after. At the line between childhood and adolescence "growing up" consists precisely in ability to participate in youth culture patterns, which are not for either sex, the same as the adult patterns practiced by the parental generation. In both sexes the transition to full adulthood means loss of a certain "glamorous" element. From being the athletic hero or the lion of college dances, the young man becomes a prosaic business executive or lawyer. The more successful adults participate in an important order of prestige symbols but these are of a very different order from those of the youth culture. The contrast in the case of the feminine role is perhaps equally sharp, with at least a strong tendency to take on a "domestic" pattern with marriage and the arrival of young children.

The symmetry in this respect must, however, not be exaggerated. It is of fundamental significance to the sex role structure of the adult age levels that the normal man has a "job" which is fundamental to his social status in general. It is perhaps not too much to say that only in very exceptional cases can an adult man be genuinely self-respecting and enjoy a respected status in the eyes of others if he does not "earn a living" in an approved occupational role. Not only is this a matter of his own economic support but, generally speaking, his occupational status is the primary source of the income and class status of his wife and children.

In the case of the feminine role the situation is radically different. The majority of married women, of course, are not employed, but even of those that are a very large proportion do not have jobs which are in basic competition for status with those of their husbands.⁴ The majority of "career"

⁴ The above statement, even more than most in the present paper, needs to be qualified in relation to the problem of class. It is above all to the upper middle class that it applies. Here probably the great majority of "working wives" are engaged in some form of secretarial

women whose occupational status is comparable with that of men in their own class, at least in the upper middle and upper classes, are unmarried, and in the small proportion of cases where they are married the result is a profound alteration in family structure.

This pattern, which is central to the urban middle classes, should not be misunderstood. In rural society, for instance, the operation of the farm and the attendant status in the community may be said to be a matter of the joint status of both parties to a marriage. Whereas a farm is operated by a family, an urban job is held by an individual and does not involve other members of the family in a comparable sense. One convenient expression of the difference lies in the question of what would happen in case of death. In the case of a farm it would at least be not at all unusual for the widow to continue operating the farm with the help of a son or even of hired men. In the urban situation the widow would cease to have any connection with the organization which had employed her husband and he would be replaced by another man without reference to family affiliations.

In this urban situation the primary status-carrying role is in a sense that of housewife. The woman's fundamental status is that of her husband's wife, the mother of his children, and traditionally the person responsible for a complex of activities in connection with the management of the household, care of children, etc.

For the structuring of sex roles in the adult phase the most fundamental considerations seem to be those involved in the interrelations of the occupational system and the conjugal family. In a certain sense the most fundamental basis of the family's status is the occupational status of the husband and father. As has been pointed out, this is a status occupied by an individual by virtue of his individual qualities and achievements. But both directly and indirectly, more than any other single factor, it determines the status of the family in the social structure, directly because of the symbolic significance of the office or occupation as a symbol of prestige, indirectly because as the principal source of family income it determines the standard of living of the family. From one point of view the emergence of occupational status into this primary position can be regarded as the principal source of strain in the sex role structure of our society since it deprives the wife of her role as a partner in a common enterprise. The common enterprise is reduced to the life of the family itself and to the informal social activities in which husband and wife participate together. This leaves the wife a set of utilitarian functions in the management of the household which may be considered a kind of "pseudo-" occupation. Since the present inter-

work which would, on an independent basis, generally be classed as a lower middle class occupation. The situation at lower levels of the class structure is quite different since the prestige of the jobs of husband and wife is then much more likely to be nearly equivalent. It is quite possible that this fact is closely related to the relative instability of marriage which Davis and Gardner (*Deep South*) find, at least for the community they studied, to be typical of lower class groups. The relation is one which deserves careful study.

est is primarily in the middle classes, the relatively unstable character of the role of housewife as the principal content of the feminine role is strongly illustrated by the tendency to employ domestic servants wherever financially possible. It is true that there is an American tendency to accept tasks of drudgery with relative willingness, but it is notable that in middle class families there tends to be a dissociation of the essential personality from the performance of these tasks. Thus, advertising continually appeals to such desires as to have hands which one could never tell had washed dishes or scrubbed floors.⁴ Organization about the function of housewife, however, with the addition of strong affectional devotion to husband and children, is the primary focus of one of the principal patterns governing the adult feminine role—what may be called the “domestic” pattern. It is, however, a conspicuous fact, that strict adherence to this pattern has become progressively less common and has a strong tendency to a residual status—that is, to be followed most closely by those who are unsuccessful in competition for prestige in other directions.

It is, of course, possible for the adult woman to follow the masculine pattern and seek a career in fields of occupational achievement in direct competition with men of her own class. It is, however, notable that in spite of the very great progress of the emancipation of women from the traditional domestic pattern only a very small fraction have gone very far in this direction. It is also clear that its generalization would only be possible with profound alterations in the structure of the family.

Hence it seems that concomitant with the alteration in the basic masculine role in the direction of occupation there have appeared two important tendencies in the feminine role which are alternative to that of simple domesticity on the one hand, and to a full-fledged career on the other. In the older situation there tended to be a very rigid distinction between respectable married women and those who were “no better than they should be.” The rigidity of this line has progressively broken down through the infiltration into the respectable sphere of elements of what may be called again the glamor pattern, with the emphasis on a specifically feminine form of attractiveness which on occasion involves directly sexual patterns of appeal. One important expression of this trend lies in the fact that many of the symbols of feminine attractiveness have been taken over directly from the practices of social types previously beyond the pale of respectable society. This would seem to be substantially true of the practice of women smoking and of at least the modern version of the use of cosmetics. The same would seem to be

⁴ This type of advertising appeal undoubtedly contains an element of “snob appeal” in the sense of an invitation to the individual by her appearance and ways to identify herself with a higher social class than that of her actual status. But it is almost certainly not wholly explained by this element. A glamorously feminine appearance which is specifically dissociated from physical work is undoubtedly a genuine part of an authentic personality ideal of the middle class, and not only evidence of a desire to belong to the upper class.

true of many of the modern versions of women's dress. "Emancipation" in this connection means primarily emancipation from traditional and conventional restrictions on the free expression of sexual attraction and impulses, but in a direction which tends to segregate the element of sexual interest and attraction from the total personality and in so doing tends to emphasize the segregation of sex roles. It is particularly notable that there has been no corresponding tendency to emphasize masculine attraction in terms of dress and other such aids. One might perhaps say that in a situation which strongly inhibits competition between the sexes on the same plane the feminine glamor pattern has appeared as an offset to masculine occupational status and to its attendant symbols of prestige. It is perhaps significant that there is a common stereotype of the association of physically beautiful, expensively and elaborately dressed women with physically unattractive but rich and powerful men.

The other principal direction of emancipation from domesticity seems to lie in emphasis on what has been called the common humanistic element. This takes a wide variety of forms. One of them lies in a relatively mature appreciation and systematic cultivation of cultural interests and educated tastes, extending all the way from the intellectual sphere to matters of art, music and house furnishings. A second consists in cultivation of serious interests and humanitarian obligations in community welfare situations and the like. It is understandable that many of these orientations are most conspicuous in fields where through some kind of tradition there is an element of particular suitability for feminine participation. Thus, a woman who takes obligations to social welfare particularly seriously will find opportunities in various forms of activity which traditionally tie up with women's relation to children, to sickness and so on. But this may be regarded as secondary to the underlying orientation which would seek an outlet in work useful to the community following the most favorable opportunities which happen to be available.

This pattern, which with reference to the character of relationship to men may be called that of the "good companion," is distinguished from the others in that it lays far less stress on the exploitation of sex role as such and more on that which is essentially common to both sexes. There are reasons, however, why cultural interests, interest in social welfare and community activities are particularly prominent in the activities of women in our urban communities. On the one side the masculine occupational role tends to absorb a very large proportion of the man's time and energy and to leave him relatively little for other interests. Furthermore, unless his position is such as to make him particularly prominent his primary orientation is to those elements of the social structure which divide the community into occupational groups rather than those which unite it in common interests and activities. The utilitarian aspect of the role of housewife, on the other hand,

has declined in importance to the point where it scarcely approaches a full-time occupation for a vigorous person. Hence the resort to other interests to fill up the gap. In addition, women, being more closely tied to the local residential community are more apt to be involved in matters of common concern to the members of that community. This peculiar role of women becomes particularly conspicuous in middle age. The younger married woman is apt to be relatively highly absorbed in the care of young children. With their growing up, however, her absorption in the household is greatly lessened, often just at the time when the husband is approaching the apex of his career and is most heavily involved in its obligations. Since to a high degree this humanistic aspect of the feminine role is only partially institutionalized it is not surprising that its patterns often bear the marks of strain and insecurity, as perhaps has been classically depicted by Helen Hokinson's cartoons of women's clubs.

The adult roles of both sexes involve important elements of strain which are involved in certain dynamic relationships, especially to the youth culture. In the case of the feminine role marriage is the single event toward which a selective process, in which personal qualities and effort can play a decisive role, has pointed up. That determines a woman's fundamental status, and after that her role patterning is not so much status determining as a matter of living up to expectations and finding satisfying interests and activities. In a society where such strong emphasis is placed upon individual achievement it is not surprising that there should be a certain romantic nostalgia for the time when the fundamental choices were still open. This element of strain is added to by the lack of clear-cut definition of the adult feminine role. Once the possibility of a career has been eliminated there still tends to be a rather unstable oscillation between emphasis in the direction of domesticity or glamor or good companionship. According to situational pressures and individual character the tendency will be to emphasize one or another of these more strongly. But it is a situation likely to produce a rather high level of insecurity. In this state the pattern of domesticity must be ranked lowest in terms of prestige but also, because of the strong emphasis in community sentiment on the virtues of fidelity and devotion to husband and children, it offers perhaps the highest level of a certain kind of security. It is no wonder that such an important symbol as Whistler's mother concentrates primarily on this pattern.

The glamor pattern has certain obvious attractions since to the woman who is excluded from the struggle for power and prestige in the occupational sphere it is the most direct path to a sense of superiority and importance. It has, however, two obvious limitations. In the first place, many of its manifestations encounter the resistance of patterns of moral conduct and engender conflicts not only with community opinion but also with the individual's own moral standards. In the second place, it is a pattern the

highest manifestations of which are inevitably associated with a rather early age level—in fact, overwhelmingly with the courtship period. Hence, if strongly entered upon serious strains result from the problem of adaptation to increasing age.

The one pattern which would seem to offer the greatest possibilities for able, intelligent, and emotionally mature women is the third—the good companion pattern. This, however, suffers from a lack of fully institutionalized status and from the multiplicity of choices of channels of expression. It is only those with the strongest initiative and intelligence who achieve fully satisfactory adaptations in this direction. It is quite clear that in the adult feminine role there is quite sufficient strain and insecurity so that wide-spread manifestations are to be expected in the form of neurotic behavior.

The masculine role at the same time is itself by no means devoid of corresponding elements of strain. It carries with it to be sure the primary prestige of achievement, responsibility and authority. By comparison with the role of the youth culture, however, there are at least two important types of limitations. In the first place, the modern occupational system has led to increasing specialization of role. The job absorbs an extraordinarily large proportion of the individual's energy and emotional interests in a role the content of which is often relatively narrow. This in particular restricts the area within which he can share common interests and experiences with others not in the same occupational specialty. It is perhaps of considerable significance that so many of the highest prestige statuses of our society are of this specialized character. There is in the definition of roles little to bind the individual to others in his community on a comparable status level. By contrast with this situation, it is notable that in the youth culture common human elements are far more strongly emphasized. Leadership and eminence are more in the role of total individuals and less of competent specialists. This perhaps has something to do with the significant tendency in our society for all age levels to idealize youth and for the older age groups to attempt to imitate the patterns of youth behavior.

It is perhaps as one phase of this situation that the relation of the adult man to persons of the opposite sex should be treated. The effect of the specialization of occupational role is to narrow the range in which the sharing of common human interests can play a large part. In relation to his wife the tendency of this narrowness would seem to be to encourage on her part either the domestic or the glamorous role, or community participation somewhat unrelated to the marriage relationship. This relationship between sex roles presumably introduces a certain amount of strain into the marriage relationship itself since this is of such overwhelming importance to the family and hence to a woman's status and yet so relatively difficult to maintain on a level of human companionship. Outside the marriage relationship,

however, there seems to be a notable inhibition against easy social intercourse, particularly in mixed company.⁶ The man's close personal intimacy with other women is checked by the danger of the situation being defined as one of rivalry with the wife, and easy friendship without sexual-emotional involvement seems to be inhibited by the specialization of interests in the occupational sphere. It is notable that brilliance of conversation of the "salon" type seems to be associated with aristocratic society and is not prominent in ours.

Along with all this goes a certain tendency for middle-aged men, as symbolized by the "bald-headed row," to be interested in the physical aspect of sex—that is, in women precisely as dissociated from those personal considerations which are important to relationships of companionship or friendship, to say nothing of marriage. In so far as it does not take this physical form, however, there seems to be a strong tendency for middle-aged men to idealize youth patterns—that is, to think of the ideal inter-sex friendship as that of their pre-marital period.⁷

In so far as the idealization of the youth culture by adults is an expression of elements of strain and insecurity in the adult roles it would be expected that the patterns thus idealized would contain an element of romantic unrealism. The patterns of youthful behavior thus idealized are not those of actual youth so much as those which older people wish their own youth might have been. This romantic element seems to coalesce with a similar element derived from certain strains in the situation of young people themselves.

The period of youth in our society is one of considerable strain and insecurity. Above all, it means turning one's back on the security both of status and of emotional attachment which is engaged in the family of orientation. It is structurally essential to transfer one's primary emotional attachment to a marriage partner who is entirely unrelated to the previous family situation. In a system of free marriage choice this applies to women as well as men. For the man there is in addition the necessity to face the hazards of occupational competition in the determination of a career. There is reason to believe that the youth culture has important positive functions in easing the transition from the security of childhood in the family of orientation to that of full adult in marriage and occupational status. But precisely because the transition is a period of strain it is to be expected that it involves elements of unrealistic romanticism. Thus significant features

⁶ In the informal social life of academic circles with which the writer is familiar there seems to be a strong tendency in mixed gatherings—as after dinner—for the sexes to segregate. In such groups the men are apt to talk either shop subjects or politics whereas the women are apt to talk about domestic affairs, schools, their children etc., or personalities. It is perhaps on personalities that mixed conversation is apt to flow most freely.

⁷ This, to be sure, often contains an element of romantization. It is more nearly what he wishes these relations had been than what they actually were.

in
coi
the
fer
not
ana
bet
the
Wo
spe
is g
to
sug
has
vid
par
rad
from
ship
rom
rela
und
any
patt
love
to a
emp
rath
idea
Th
thro
the
Unit
parti
tural
the f
struc
to sa
wife
when

* C
World

in the status of youth patterns in our society would seem to derive from the coincidence of the emotional needs of adolescents with those derived from the strains of the situation of adults.

A tendency to the romantic idealization of youth patterns seems in different ways to be characteristic of modern western society as a whole.⁸ It is not possible in the present context to enter into any extended comparative analysis, but it may be illuminating to call attention to a striking difference between the patterns associated with this phenomenon in Germany and in the United States. The German "youth movement," starting before the first World War, has occasioned a great deal of comment and has in various respects been treated as the most notable instance of the revolt of youth. It is generally believed that the youth movement has an important relation to the background of National Socialism, and this fact as much as any suggests the important difference. While in Germany as everywhere there has been a generalized revolt against convention and restrictions on individual freedom as embodied in the traditional adult culture, in Germany particular emphasis has appeared on the community of male youth. "Comradeship" in a sense which strongly suggests that of soldiers in the field has from the beginning been strongly emphasized as the ideal social relationship. By contrast with this, in the American youth culture and its adult romantization a much stronger emphasis has been placed on the cross-sex relationship. It would seem that this fact, with the structural factors which underlie it, have much to do with the failure of the youth culture to develop any considerable political significance in this country. Its predominant pattern has been that of the idealization of the isolated couple in romantic love. There have, to be sure, been certain tendencies among radical youth to a political orientation but in this case there has been a notable absence of emphasis on the solidarity of the members of one sex. The tendency has been rather to ignore the relevance of sex difference in the interest of common ideals.

The importance of youth patterns in contemporary American culture throws into particularly strong relief the status in our social structure of the most advanced age groups. By comparison with other societies the United States assumes an extreme position in the isolation of old age from participation in the most important social structures and interests. Structurally speaking, there seem to be two primary bases of this situation. In the first place, the most important single distinctive feature of our family structure is the isolation of the individual conjugal family. It is impossible to say that with us it is "natural" for any other group than husband and wife and their dependent children to maintain a common household. Hence, when the children of a couple have become independent through marriage

⁸ Cf. E. Y. Hartshorne, "German Youth and the Nazi Dream of Victory," *America in a World at War*, Pamphlet, No. 12, New York, 1941.

and occupational status the parental couple is left without attachment to any continuous kinship group. It is, of course, common for other relatives to share a household with the conjugal family but this scarcely ever occurs without some important elements of strain. For independence is certainly the preferred pattern for an elderly couple, particularly from the point of view of the children.

The second basis of the situation lies in the occupational structure. In such fields as farming and the maintenance of small independent enterprises there is frequently no such thing as abrupt "retirement," rather a gradual relinquishment of the main responsibilities and functions with advancing age. So far, however, as an individual's occupational status centers in a specific "job," he either holds the job or does not, and the tendency is to maintain the full level of functions up to a given point and then abruptly to retire. In view of the very great significance of occupational status and its psychological correlates, retirement leaves the older man in a peculiarly functionless situation, cut off from participation in the most important interests and activities of the society. There is a further important aspect of this situation. Not only status in the community but actual place of residence is to a very high degree a function of the specific job held. Retirement not only cuts the ties to the job itself but also greatly loosens those to the community of residence. Perhaps in no other society is there observable a phenomenon corresponding to the accumulation of retired elderly people in such areas as Florida and Southern California in the winter. It may be surmised that this structural isolation from kinship, occupational, and community ties is the fundamental basis of the recent political agitation for help to the old. It is suggested that it is far less the financial hardship⁹ of the position of elderly people than their social isolation which makes old age a "problem." As in other connections we are here very prone to rationalize generalized insecurity in financial and economic terms. The problem is obviously of particularly great significance in view of the changing age distribution of the population with the prospect of a far greater proportion in the older age groups than in previous generations. It may also be suggested, that through well-known psychosomatic mechanisms, the increased incidence of the disabilities of older people, such as heart disease, cancer, etc. may be at least in part attributed to this structural situation.

⁹ That the financial difficulties of older people are in a very large proportion of cases real is not to be doubted. This, however, is at least to a very large extent a consequence rather than a determinant of the structural situation. Except where it is fully taken care of by pension schemes, the income of older people is apt to be seriously reduced, but, even more important, the younger conjugal family usually does not feel an obligation to contribute to the support of aged parents. Where as a matter of course both generations shared a common household, this problem did not exist.

I
rep
of c
mar
mus
B
tinc
spor
syst
we s
the
relev
cultu
may
self-c
irresp
not r
of th
We r
most
devia
the p
age a
Ad
ment.
gener
the in
It i
indivi
them

* Pr

THE ADJUSTMENT OF THE INDIVIDUAL TO HIS AGE AND SEX ROLES*

LEONARD S. COTTRELL, JR.

Cornell University

Points of interest. Some concisely stated hypotheses and a frame of reference for research on social adjustment. Clues toward a more precise diagnosis of the cause of frustration in our American society.
[Ed.]

IN DISCUSSING the adjustment of the individual to his age and sex roles, I shall be using the term role to refer to an internally consistent series of conditioned responses by one member of a social situation which represents the stimulus pattern for a similarly internally consistent series of conditioned responses of the other(s) in that situation. Dealing with human behavior in terms of roles, therefore, requires that any item of behavior must always be placed in some specified self-other context.

By way of further clarification it is necessary to call attention to the distinction between the use of the term role to refer to a modal system of responses which constitutes the culturally expected behavior and the particular system of responses with which a specific individual operates. Thus, when we speak of the individual's ability to perform in his sex role, we refer to the relation which his behavior, in situations in which sex classification is relevant, bears to some modal pattern expected in a given cultural or sub-cultural group. On the other hand, even though he may deviate widely and may properly be said not to be acting in the proper role, his own particular self-other pattern is his role also. If a middle class husband is indifferent and irresponsible and expects his wife to support and stabilize the family, he is not manifesting the particular complex of behavior we expect from the role of the husband, but he nevertheless has a particular role in his marriage. We may refer then to cultural roles and unique roles. The distinction is most obvious when we have a person equipped with both a cultural and a deviant pattern. The present discussion is directed to the consideration of the problem of adjustment to the cultural role or roles assigned to a given age and sex classification.

Adjustment is usually indicated negatively as the degree of maladjustment. We may assume that the amount of tension, anxiety and frustration generated by the attempt to discover and play a given role is an index of the individual's adjustment to such a role.

It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss particular problems which individuals encounter in adjusting to culturally defined roles required of them because of membership in given age, sex, class, caste and other social

* Presented to the American Sociological Society, Dec. 27, 1941, at New York City.

categories. The illuminating investigations of Benedict,¹ Blos,² Davis,³ Dollard,⁴ Folsom,⁵ Linton,⁶ Mead,⁷ Warner,⁸ Zachry⁹ and others have made this unnecessary.

Rather, I shall try to summarize and integrate the findings and insights of these workers into a series of propositions covering what appear to be the chief determinants of the degree of adjustment an individual is likely to realize as he functions in a given social role in a given culture.

A consideration of adjustment to any social category role centers around two closely associated problems:

(1) The adjustment to a role called for by the social category (in the present discussion, age-sex classes) to which the individual presently belongs.

(2) The adjustment to the shifts in role made necessary by the progression from one category to another.

The following propositions are pointed to these two problems. While they deal specifically with age-sex roles, they are applicable to any social role.

No claim is made that the statements which follow are conclusively established. Actually the research data and informal observations supporting them are very fragmentary. The propositions are in the nature of hypotheses for which the available evidence offers some support but which require crucial testing by systematic research.

PROPOSITIONS

I. The degree of adjustment to roles which a society assigns to its age-sex categories varies directly with the clarity with which such roles are defined.

1. The degree of clarity is determined by the proportion of the social situations in which the individual is called on to act for which there are explicit definitions of the reciprocal behavior expected.

2. Clarity of definition of role is reduced by:

(1) Discrepancies between what is given verbally and what is demonstrated in practice.

(2) Contacts among members of subculture groups which have different roles for the same age-sex categories.

¹ Ruth Benedict, "Continuities and Discontinuities in Cultural Conditioning," *Psychiatry*, 1: 161-167, May 1938.

² Peter Blos, *The Adolescent Personality*, New York, 1941.

³ Allison Davis, "American Status Systems and the Socialization of the Child," *American Sociological Review*, 6: 345-356, 1941.

⁴ Allison Davis and John Dollard, *Children of Bondage*, Washington, 1940.

⁵ G. Lawton, et al., "Symposium on Old Age and Aging," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 10: 27-88, 1940. See especially the paper by J. K. Folsom and the discussion of it by Lawrence K. Frank.

⁶ Ralph Linton, "A Neglected Aspect of Social Organization," *American Sociological Review*, 45: 870-886, 1940.

⁷ Margaret Mead, *Sex and Temperament*, New York, 1935.

⁸ W. Lloyd Warner, and Paul S. Lunt, *The Social Life of a Modern Community*, New Haven, 1941.

⁹ Caroline B. Zachry, *Emotion and Conduct in Adolescence*, New York, 1940.

INDIVIDUAL ADJUSTMENT TO AGE AND SEX ROLES 619

- (3) Inconsistency in the response and expectations exhibited to the individual by members of his social world.

II. The degree of adjustment to specified age-sex roles varies directly with the consistency with which others in the individual's life situations exhibit to him the response called for by his role.

III. When a society assigns or permits more than one role to a given age-sex category, the degree of adjustment to the roles varies directly with the compatibility of the roles.

IV. When incompatible roles belong to a given age-sex category, the degree of adjustment varies directly with the extent to which means exist for minimizing the overlap of situations calling for incompatible roles.

V. The degree of adjustment varies indirectly with the discrepancy between the abilities of the individual and those required in the roles of a given age-sex category.

VI. The degree of adjustment to the roles of specified age-sex categories varies directly with the extent to which the role permits the individual to realize the dominant goals set by his sub-cultural group.

VII. When the role represents an excess of deprivation or frustration of dominant goal satisfactions adjustment varies directly with:

1. The extent to which the frustrating role is defined as a path to another role which promises the desired gratifications, and/or
2. The accessibility of substitute gratifications.

The remaining propositions have to do with adjustment to transitions from one role to another.

VIII. The degree of adjustment to a future role varies directly with the degree of clarity with which the future role is defined.

IX. The degree of adjustment to a future role varies directly with the amount of opportunity for:

1. Emotionally intimate contact which allows identification with persons functioning in the role.
2. Imaginal or incipient rehearsal in the future role, and
3. Practice in the role through play or other similar activity.

X. The degree of adjustment to a future role varies directly with the degree of importance attached to and the definiteness of the transitional procedures used by the society in designating the change in role.

XI. The degree of adjustment to a future role varies directly with the completeness of the shift in the responses and expectations exhibited by the society to the individual in his new role.

XII. Adjustment to more mature roles is aided rather than handicapped by occasional sanctioned regressions to less demanding roles.

It is my opinion that if these propositions were put in the form of questions about any given cultural role, the answers would fairly precisely indicate the degree of adjustment which individuals are likely to make to such a role. The answers would also indicate the chief sources of the maladjust-

ment. What is more, if the propositions were applied as questions to the series of social roles comprising a given social system, the answers would indicate the points in the social structure with the greatest hazards to social adjustment and the probable sources of such hazards.

It is also my opinion that the propositions provide a basis for asking questions which are capable of answers and, for the most part, reasonably precise if not actually quantitative answers. Obviously the propositions will have to be reduced to a series of properly weighted items if the implied relations are to be stated quantitatively.

Each of the propositions implies a simple linear relationship. However, it is quite probable that there are limits beyond which a linear relation does not exist. Furthermore, the factors said to affect adjustment operate simultaneously in a configuration and thus modify one another in their manifest effects.

A cursory application of the propositions to a few specific social categories will demonstrate their utility for analyzing the phenomena of social adjustment. For example, compare the results of such applications to the adolescent, the young adult, the older adult, and the aged; or to the various prestige class ranks; or to categories such as those of the settled Yankee farmer and the middle class urban woman. If time permitted a detailed examination of such test applications we could probably demonstrate that this frame of reference offers a fruitful approach to the whole question of social adjustment.

Any discussion of adjustment not only involves problems of descriptive analysis and interpretation but inevitably leads to questions of value. Indeed, the implicit if not explicit motivation for each such descriptive analyses is the search for more desirable and rewarding social arrangements, as Mead's excellent discussion of sex and temperament¹⁰ so amply demonstrates. The present propositions are not designed to deal with questions of relative desirability. However, in so far as they aid in clarifying what is, they will serve to point to the instrumentalities for achieving what ought to be.

¹⁰ Margaret Mead, *Op. cit.*, pp. xiii-xxii and 279-322.

I
whi
tha
sen
fun
me
vest
in a
min
T
it ca
role
been
defin
to ob
TH
ning
Duri
Man
prese
const
nomi
made
the ro
Th
erence
respon
* Th
lished in
Council

COMMUNITY ROLES IN ATTITUDE FORMATION*

THEODORE M. NEWCOMB

University of Michigan

Points of interest. The roles played by the conservatives in a progressive community. What kinds of persons fail to see themselves as they are on the scale of conservatism-progressivism? The relations between political-economic attitudes, community cooperation, and personality traits established in earlier years. [Ed.]

IT IS THE thesis of this paper that the personality processes involved in attitude formation are closely related to the adaptive devices by which an individual comes to occupy a given position in any group or groups which take a characteristic attitude toward the issue in question. It follows that observations or measurements of position in the group provide an essential kind of data to those concerned with the problem of how personality functions as social attitudes are developed. If this sounds like a truism, let me remind you, first, that it is almost totally unsupported by empirical investigation; and secondly, that almost all attitude research has been cast in a framework of individual rather than of group and community determinants.

The phrase "position of the individual in the group" is a vague one, but it can be rendered concrete and objective in terms of roles. The concept of role has been much honored in social-psychological discussions, but it has been honored more in the breach than in the observance of quantitative definitions. It is here proposed to relate certain measured attitude changes to objectively determined changing roles in a given group.

The group selected for study consisted of the entire student body at Bennington College during the four academic years between 1935 and 1939. During each of these years there were approximately 250 women students. Many attitude scales were given repeatedly during these years, but the present results are drawn almost exclusively from a single attitude scale, constructed according to Likert's methods, labeled "Political and Economic Progressivism"—P. E. P. for short. It had to do primarily with issues made prominent by the New Deal, such as organized labor, public relief, and the role of corporate wealth.

This particular attitude scale was chosen not because of any chance preferences of the investigator, but because investigation revealed that it corresponded closely to the issues which were most alive in this community

* This paper is a partial summary of the writer's *Personality and Social Change*, to be published in 1942. The study was made possible by grants-in-aid from the Social Science Research Council.

during these years. Since the major determinants of attitude formation are here described in community-wide terms, it is important to describe, briefly at least, the nature of this community.

The college is situated on a hilltop four miles from the Vermont village from which it takes its name. It is a very young institution; the first year of this study was the fourth year of the college's existence, i.e., the first year in which there was a senior class. Its educational plan is somewhat novel, particularly its emphasis upon individual diagnosis and guidance. As the result of the relative novelty of this plan, of the smallness of the total group, of the *camaraderie* and informality of faculty-student relationships, and of the limitations of nearby extra-college attractions the community may be described as highly integrated, self-contained, and self-conscious. Another important consideration, commonly omitted in reports of attitude studies, is the fact that the majority of the faculty (including the investigator) were commonly described as "liberal," though the term "radical" was preferred by some.

This study deals with individual attitude changes projected against the backdrop of the community setting. The first aspect of the community setting to be noted is that the great majority of students became less conservative after one, two, or three years in the community (conservatism is here defined exclusively in terms of scored responses to attitude scales). While the data here presented refer only to the P.E.P. scale, the same trend was observed with regard to every attitude scale employed, including such issues as Loyalist Spain, the C.I.O., President Roosevelt's proposal for Supreme Court reform, and Bogardus social distance. Table 1 indicates the extent of this trend in political terms, according to one questionnaire response.

TABLE 1. PERCENT OF PREFERENCES BY STUDENTS AND THEIR PARENTS FOR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES IN 1936

	52 Freshmen		40 Sophomores		52 Juniors-Seniors	
	Students	Parents	Students	Parents	Students	Parents
Landon	62	66	43	69	15	60
Roosevelt	29	26	43	22	54	35
Thomas-Browder	9	7	15	8	30	4

Table 2 indicates the freshman and senior attitudes in terms of mean P.E.P. score, based upon a 26-item scale, each item of which was scored from 1 to 5, high scores being conservative. Thus 130 is the most conservative possible score, and 26 the least conservative possible score. This table does not, of course, reveal the attitude differences between freshmen and the same individuals, three years later, as seniors. This difference, for the one class which was followed throughout its entire four years in college, was of approximately the same magnitude as those appearing in Table 2—to be

exact, 12 points. In spite of the small numbers involved, it also is a statistically reliable difference, the critical ratio being 5.9.

TABLE 2. MEAN P.E.P. SCORES AND CRITICAL RATIOS

		Freshmen		Seniors		Critical Ratio*
		N	Mn	N	Mn	
Fall	1935	88	74.5	45	65.8	3.87
Fall	1936	69	75.8	27	60.1	6.49
Spring	1938	86	70.6	37	59.9	4.58
Spring	1939	73	72.8	45	62.7	4.55

* Based upon differences between freshmen and junior-senior mean scores, because of the smallness of the senior groups. The differences between junior and senior scores are slight.

The second important aspect of the community setting is that non-conservatism is related to prestige, measured in terms of frequency of choice as one of five students most worthy to represent the college at a hypothetical intercollegiate gathering.* The relationship between prestige, thus measured, and conservatism is shown in Table 3. The results in the following year were almost exactly the same. Very similar results were also obtained from another question, asked at the same time, but couched in terms of personal desirability as a friend.

TABLE 3. MEAN P.E.P. SCORES, CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO FREQUENCY OF BEING CHOSEN AS REPRESENTATIVE (1938)

Frequency of Choice	Freshmen		Sophomores		Junior-Seniors		Entire College	
	N	Mn	N	Mn	N	Mn	N	Mn
40-89	—	—	3	60.3	5	50.4	8	54.1
12-39	—	—	5	65.6	15	57.6	20	59.7
5-11	—	—	5	65.3	18	62.2	23	62.7
2-4	10	64.6	18	68.6	19	61.6	47	65.3
1	12	63.4	17	68.6	15	62.1	44	65.0
0	61	72.8	39	71.3	14	69.0	114	71.7

A third aspect of the community setting is the finding that conservatism is also related to reputation for community-cooperativeness as opposed to community negativism. These results were obtained from "Guess-Who" ratings made by a group of 24 students, carefully selected so as to represent every cross-section and grouping of importance within the college. As here employed, this technique involved the naming by each of the 24 judges of three individuals from each class who were most extreme in each of 28 characteristics described. One way of presenting these results is shown in Table 4, where those 13 juniors and seniors who have changed least from freshman scores are contrasted with those 13 whose scores have declined most.

* These responses were obtained, in two consecutive years, in sealed envelopes from 99% of the student body.

TABLE 4. NUMBER OF LEAST AND MOST CHANGING JUNIORS AND SENIORS WHO WERE NOMINATED MORE THAN ONCE FOR CERTAIN GUESS-WHO ITEMS*

Out of 13 individuals not decreasing in P.E.P. score	Out of 13 individuals decreasing most in P.E.P. score	
9	1	most absorbed in social life and week-ends outside of college
0	5	most absorbed in college community affairs
5	1	most critical of faculty or administrative staff
5	1	least concerned about educational policies of the college
1	5	anxious to hold positions of community responsibility
5	0	most resistant to community codes, standards, etc.
2	6	most likely to be enthusiastic supporters of the college
7	0	least apt to continue pursuits related to college interests
4	0	most likely to lead life of sheltered leisure
2	6	least likely to be deterred by family disapproval

* The top line of Table 4 is to be read as follows: nine of the thirteen individuals who failed to become less conservative in P.E.P. score are named by more than one Guess-Who rater as being most absorbed in social life and week-ends outside of college, while one of the thirteen whose P.E.P. scores changed most in a non-conservative direction is thus mentioned by more than one Guess-Who rater. The ten items selected for inclusion in this table are representative of the total 28 items, with the exception of four which showed only slight differences between the two groups; for the sake of brevity the others are not here included.

So much by way of backdrop and setting. Before going on to a discussion of individual roles in such a setting, it may be pointed out that a fairly obvious conclusion seems to have emerged, viz., that full community assimilation involves the taking on of less conservative attitudes. From this it might be deduced as a hypothesis that any sort of negativistic role in this community would not be accompanied by decreasing conservatism, whereas community-participating roles would be accompanied by decreasing conservatism. This is equivalent to saying that generalized anti-community roles include rejection of the dominant attitude patterns, while generalized pro-community roles include acceptance of them. Further investigation, however, reveals that this is far too simple.

The fact is that a minority of reputedly enthusiastic and community-cooperative individuals do not become less conservative in attitude, and that a minority of those whose attitudes do become less conservative are not reputedly community-cooperative. Any adequate theory of community-relationship and its bearing upon attitude formation must make room for these minorities as well as for the majority groupings.

One of the shortcomings of the too-simple theory outlined above is its assumption that community roles may be adequately delineated solely on the

basis of observations of an individual's behavior by others. Many lines of evidence suggest that an individual's own view of his community role has a good deal to do with the manner of his adaptation to it. This self-view, here referred to as *subjective role*, may or may not be much like the *objective role*, i.e., that based upon external behavior observations. As a matter of fact a definition of role which includes both its objective and its subjective aspects goes far toward accounting for the apparent discrepancies noted above. Let us therefore turn to the question of measuring the subjective role.

About half of the P.E.P. items were reproduced in somewhat abbreviated form at the left of a sheet of paper. On the right were three columns headed, respectively, "freshman," "juniors-seniors," and "faculty." Directions were as follows: "First, indicate your agreement or disagreement with the statement. Then make an estimate, in each column, of what percent of each group (freshman, faculty, etc.) agrees with the statement." Several group findings from these responses are of interest. For example, nearly all freshmen consider their own class much more conservative than themselves, but consider juniors and seniors less conservative than themselves; nearly all seniors consider freshmen much more conservative than themselves, but a majority of seniors consider themselves more conservative than most of the class.

Of several possible ways of handling these responses for individual purposes, the most promising was that of calculating, for each individual, the *degree of divergence from estimated class majority*, i.e., divergence from her estimate of the class to which she belonged. Total conservative divergence was taken as the sum of the estimated class percentages of non-conservative response to all items answered conservatively by the subject. Total non-conservative divergence, similarly, is the sum of the estimated class percentages of conservative response to all items answered non-conservatively by the subject. Final score equals total conservative minus total non-conservative divergence, divided by the number of items responded to.*

Divergence score, which may have either plus or minus value, thus represents the average degree to which the subject considers her own responses to be more conservative than those of her class. In the following paragraphs, those subjects whose scores of divergence are opposite in direction to that shown by their actual attitude scores are labeled "unaware." That

* E.g., suppose that a subject's estimates of non-conservative response by her class to the 4 items which she herself answers conservatively are 20, 40, 40, and 50; her total conservative divergence is the sum of these percentages, or 150. If her estimates of conservative response by her class to the remaining ten items, which she answers non-conservatively, are 60, 50, 40, 40, 30, 30, 20, 20, 10, and 0, her total non-conservative divergence is the sum of these, or 300. Divergence score is thus $(150 - 300) \div 14$, or -10.7 . This score, which is taken to indicate that the subject estimates her class's position as slightly more conservative than her own, is simply a weighted algebraic average of the estimated percentages of class disagreement with own response: the number times the amount of non-conservative disagreements outweighs the number times the amount of conservative disagreements to the average amount of 10.7.

is, if divergence score is minus for an individual whose P.E.P. score is actually considerably above the class average, she has estimated her class as more conservative than herself when objective scores show the reverse to be the case; she is therefore considered unaware of her own relative conservatism. Among the subjects discussed in the next few pages, those whose self-estimates of divergence are rather slight are also labeled "unaware," since their actual scores are rather extreme. Those whose self-estimated divergence is relatively great, and in the same direction as that shown by attitude scores, are labeled "aware"; i.e., they are aware of their own attitude positions as being relatively conservative, or relatively non-conservative, as the case may be.*

An intensive study was now begun of all of the members of the two consecutive graduating classes except those whose final P.E.P. scores were within one-half standard deviation of the class average. Roughly speaking, the most conservative and least conservative quarters of these two classes were thus studied, including 43 individuals altogether. The sources for this intensive study included all the questionnaire responses over a period of three or four years; the official college records, including extensive reports by instructors on various aspects of personality, and the medical and psychiatric as well as the academic files; and the records of a semi-standardized interview held with each senior concerning her history of attitude development. The manner in which all these data were used will appear later; for purposes of classification by role, however, only three sorts of objective data were used: P.E.P. score for classification as conservative or non-conservative, reputation according to Guess-Who ratings for objective role, and self-estimate of conservative divergence for subjective role.

In Table 5 are shown both the mode of classifying these 43 subjects, and their individual scores of estimated conservative divergence. Classifications of objective role were made upon the following basis: individuals mentioned by two or more Guess-Who raters as resistant or indifferent in two or more items are considered "negativistic," provided they are not also considered cooperative by two or more raters on more than one item. All other conservative subjects are labeled "non-negativistic." Individuals mentioned by two or more Guess-Who raters as community-cooperative in two or more items are labeled "cooperative," provided they are not also named by two or more raters as being negativistic. All other non-conservatives are labeled "non-cooperative."

The rationale of this classification into four groups of conservatives and

* Five subjects of the 48 whose records were otherwise suitable for inclusion in this part of the study were eliminated from consideration because their estimates of divergence were at a border-line point. This procedure is justified only because it is not claimed that the patterns here described represent all of those which are to be found. It is claimed only that certain patterns may be found, by such a mode of classifying, which are significant for the problem at hand.

COMMUNITY ROLES IN ATTITUDE FORMATION

627

TABLE 5. MEAN PERCENT ESTIMATES OF CONSERVATIVE DIVERGENCE,
FOR SELECTED GROUPS OF SENIORS*

<i>Conservative Subjects</i>			
Negativistic and Aware		Non-Negativistic and Aware	
Q 10	+26.8	F 32	+27.9
Q 12	+23.9	Q 28	+22.1
G 32	+12.9	Q 35	+21.4
F 22	+11.1	Q 78	+18.9
E 2	+10.7	Q 73	+10.7
Negativistic and Unaware		Non-negativistic and Unaware	
Q 47	- 0.7	Q 68	0.0
L 12	- 2.1	Q 70	- 1.1
Q 19	- 0.7	D 22	- 6.1
Q 81	- 4.2	M 12	-10.6
Q 60	-13.6		
<i>Non-conservative Subjects</i>			
Non-cooperative and Unaware		Cooperative and Unaware	
Q 25	- 7.9	Q 61	+ 8.2
E 22	- 8.6	Q 57	-12.9
Q 6	-11.8	Q 72	-13.2
Q 62	-12.1	Q 75	-13.9
D 52	-15.7	Q 63	-15.0
		E 12	-16.7
Non-cooperative and Aware		Cooperative and Aware	
C 32	-27.7	Q 83	-21.4
Q 71	-27.7	E 72	-21.8
Q 7	-28.6	M 42	-21.9
Q 9	-30.0	H 32	-23.2
Q 21	-30.2	Q 22	-34.3
K 42	-30.7	B 72	-34.7
		Q 43	-35.7

* The code numbers, e.g., Q 10, F 32, refer to individual students. These code numbers are not the same as those used during the four years in which the data were being gathered.

four groups of non-conservatives is as follows. Individuals, in such a community as this, tend to be assigned labels in terms of the degree of active community participation shown. Some of those assigned a given label, e.g., negativistic, have self-assigned roles corresponding to their reputations, but the self-assigned roles of others do not correspond to the reputed roles. The personality processes by which a given degree of conservatism is arrived at are presumably different for these two groups alike in objective role but different in subjective role. More concretely, two hypotheses may be stated: (1) that the personality processes by which a given degree of conservatism is arrived at are similar for those alike both in objective and in

subjective role, (2) that these processes are different for those alike either in objective or in subjective role but different for the other role.

With these hypotheses in mind, the available personality data were assembled for each of the eight groups of subjects. Space forbids any lengthy presentation of these data. The brief summaries here reported are condensed in such manner to show those personality characteristics applying to all members of each group which appear to be directly involved in the attitudinal history of the subjects during their three or four years in college.

Take, for example, the two groups of negativistic conservatives. Those who are not aware of their own relative conservatism, i.e., who believe they are attitudinally typical, are found to be timid and socially insecure,* to have small and limited groups of friends, and to come to college with almost no aspirations toward "social success." This latter characteristic is clearly related to their almost complete failure to achieve any sort of "social success" in pre-college relationships. The negativistic conservatives who are aware of their own relative conservatism are markedly less retiring and less inhibited, are more socially facile; they do not, like the unawares, tend to belong to compact little friendship groups; unlike the unawares, they had achieved a considerable degree of pre-college social success, and came to college with high hopes of continued success—hopes which were doomed to disappointment. In short, the unawares are insulated in tiny social groups; their negativism functions as a protective shell of indifference toward what they cannot cope with; hence their unawareness. The negativism of the awares is an aggressive reaction to the frustration of the ambitions which were at first directed at the total community; hence their awareness.

Among the non-negativistic conservatives, the distinctions between the awares and the unawares are partly similar to and partly different from the preceding distinctions. The awares have markedly greater self-confidence and possess greater social skills; they are eager and enthusiastic, whereas the unawares tend to be plodding and conscientious. The awares have considerable prestige, the unawares almost none. Both groups show more than average attachment to and dependence upon parents, but the crucial distinction seems to be that the unawares were so absorbed by home and family conflicts and allegiances as to be scarcely at all susceptible to community-wide college influences, while the awares, equally "loyal" to parents, were capable of maintaining a divided allegiance; i.e., they yielded to all college community influences except those attitudinal ones which would have brought conflict with parents. The unawares, unable to cope with two worlds, participate only superficially in college community life; hence their unawareness. The awares are capable of participating in both worlds, but

* Space forbids the presentation of the data upon the basis of which these generalizations are made. Full documentation is to be found in the writer's forthcoming monograph.

reject such college influences as would result in home conflict; hence their awareness.

Among the two groups of non-cooperative non-conservatives, both of which may be described as passively conforming rather than as negativistic, the unawares are considered dependent upon instructors, and anxious to please, while the awares are highly independent. The unawares are eager and enthusiastic, while the awares are not. The awares are more outstanding academically, and it is clear that they have set higher standards for themselves. The unawares believe that they would follow the majority attitude trend in a conservative college, while the awares would not. The unawares describe their major ambitions, on entering college, in terms of friendship rather than of prestige, while the reverse is true of the awares, for whom intellectual prestige is particularly important. Self-interpretations, finally, show the unawares tend to think of their own attitude change as just one aspect of being assimilated into the community; hence their unawareness of their own relative non-conservatism. The awares, however, tend to think of their attitude change as an intellectual achievement in respect to which they have outdistanced most students, and hence their awareness.

The two groups of cooperative non-conservatives have much in common. Both are composed of "substantial citizens," hard-working and conscientious, though the unawares are considered more enthusiastic and the awares more persistent. Both groups are high in prestige; both groups had achieved considerable recognition before coming to college, though memories of pre-college "failures" are more acute on the part of the unawares. They differ primarily in the following respects: the unawares are more anxious to please, and need more guidance from instructors. The awares are much more commonly described as "meticulous" or "perfectionist," and are more apt to be intellectual leaders. The awares have come to reformulate their ambitions less in terms of personal success and more in terms of the success of "causes." In short, lack of awareness on the part of the one group represents loyal cooperation in respect to approved social attitudes; as "leaders" they must, of course, be slightly "ahead" of the majority, but not too far. The awares, on the other hand, are not only sufficiently secure that they can afford to go beyond the majority, but their awareness is a mark of the hard-won struggle by which they reached their non-conservative positions; hence of course, they are aware.

In short, it may be said for each of the eight groups that the personality processes which appear to be essentially responsible for whatever attitude adaptation is made are also responsible for whatever degrees of awareness is shown. Those who are conservative because they have avoided the community could scarcely have an opportunity to discover that they are conservative. Those who are conservative because they aimed at leadership,

failed, and repudiated whatever the community stood for could scarcely fail to be aware of their own conservatism. Those who have acquired more than the average degree of non-conservatism because they are anxious to conform cannot be aware of their own relative extremeness, else they would withdraw to a more moderate position. Those who are extremely non-conservative because they need to excel must be aware that they are somewhat extreme, etc.

Such is the rationale of the classification of individuals on the basis of roles. Objective roles are assigned, with more or less correctness, by fellow community members on the basis of observable personality characteristics. Among those assigned similar objective roles, different subjective roles are self-assigned on the basis of other personality characteristics. Those for whom objective and subjective roles are similar, according to "objective" data, thus have many personality characteristics in common. The point worthy of emphasis, however, is not merely that certain groups of subjects can be objectively classified in such manner that common personality characteristics are found, but rather that these common personality characteristics are directly related to the processes of personality adaptation by which attitudes are acquired in a given community.

Such findings suggest the following conclusions as to the theory of attitude formation. The personality processes revealed by these subjects must be conceptualized in terms which have group or community referents. The concepts of objective and subjective role, here defined in terms of simple measurements, serve the scientific purpose of delineating the conditions under which several individuals, with differing personal histories and personality organizations, arrive at similar attitude positions by similar personality processes. (This channeling of unique, diverse personalities into a limited number of patterns, in respect to attitude formation, is the result of the limited number of roles for which the community makes allowance. *It is the community role which mediates between social attitudes and total personality organization.* But the processes by which individual personalities are led to make such patterned adaptations become clear only as we conceive of role as a dually enforced limitation of behavior. As here employed the objective limitation corresponds to degree and manner of community participation which is recognized within the community; and the subjective limitation corresponds to the individual's perception of his own relationship in a given context (i.e., social attitudes) to such norms as he recognizes.

EFFECT OF THE WAR DECLARATION ON THE NATIONAL MORALE OF AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS*

DELBERT C. MILLER

State College of Washington†

Points of interest. National morale of college students definitely increased after Pearl Harbor, but not as much as might be wished. Regional differences and their interpretations. Relation to personal morale. Persistence of certain unhealthy attitudes. Need for confidence in post-war democracy. [Ed.]

I *The Problem and Initial Plans.* In September, 1941, this research project was formulated in view of the imminent prospect of military intervention in World War II by the United States. Plans were laid to measure the national morale of a large number of college students in many different sections of the nation. Professors serving five colleges were contacted and asked if they would cooperate in an experiment to determine the national morale exhibited by their students, now and at some later date—"perhaps at the outbreak of war." In October, 1941, five colleges were measured by the Washington State Survey of Opinions, a scale to measure national morale.¹ On December 7, 1941, the war came to America. Five days later a measurement of national morale was made at the State College of Washington, one of the selected schools, and on February, 1942, a re-measurement was made at four of the cooperating institutions. This research, therefore, reveals the immediate and delayed effect of the United States entrance into war upon the thinking of 500 college students within the limits of the measuring instrument.

1. The Population Studied. The five colleges participating in the study were University of New Hampshire, Johnson C. Smith University (Negro, North Carolina), Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, State College of Washington, and a college in Indiana (fictitiously titled "Midwestern"). These schools provide samples from the Northeast, Southeast, Southwest, East North Central, and Pacific Coast sections of the United States. The number of students in the samples totalled 477 in October and 380 in February. Instructions for securing samples read, "Please attempt to secure approximately equal numbers of men and women students, one half of them in the junior college and one half in the senior college." Such instructions have now been shown to be unnecessary since age and sex in the college population are unrelated to national morale.² When such large numbers of

* This study was made possible by the cooperation of Professors William H. Sewell, Joseph Bachelder, Jr., M. E. Thomasson, Carl E. Dent and R.M.D.

† The author is on leave, with the Sperry Gyroscope Company, Brooklyn, N.Y.

¹ Delbert C. Miller, "The Measurement of National Morale," *Amer. Sociol. Rev.*, 6: 487-498, August, 1941; "National Morale of American College Students in 1941"; *Amer. Sociol. Rev.*, 7: 194-213, April, 1942.

² D. C. Miller, "National Morale of American College Students in 1941," *Amer. Sociol. Rev.*, 7 (April, 1942), p. 200.

cases as 50 to 100 per sample are taken, the parameters of the supply are accurately approximated by the statistics. However, in the beginning it was necessary to exercise particular caution in order to obtain representative data.

2. *Instrument of Measurement.*—The Washington State Survey of Opinions is an attitude scale to measure national morale. The construction of the scale was preceded by efforts to clarify the concept of national morale and to build a scale measuring the major factors that are involved. Briefly, we have held that *national morale pertains to all factors in the individual's life that bring about his energetic participation in the tasks which most effectively secure the national goals*. The components of national morale include: (1) belief in the superiority of the social structure of the ingroup; (2) degree and manner by which personal goals are identified with national goals; (3) judgments of the competence of national leadership; (4) belief that resources are available to hurl back any threats to the ingroup; (5) confidence in the permanence of the national goals. On this theory of national morale a survey of opinions was formulated and by appropriate technique a cluster of discriminating attitudes was identified. The items in the final survey, named the Washington State Survey of Opinions, can be examined by reference to Table 3.

The reliability coefficient obtained for odd vs. even items, based on responses from all 477 persons of the initial measurement, is .84. It is generally agreed that the validity of opinion frequencies as an index of national morale must depend upon whether opinion correlates with action. The attempt to secure such a demonstration of validity led me to correlate national morale scores with the buying of United States War Bonds and Stamps and with the giving of volunteer work or contribution to Britain or her Allies. During the earlier work correlations were sought by lumping together all of the samples. Only low correlations resulted, viz. $r_{bis} = .16$, $r_{bis} = .20$ (negative signs appear because low scores on scale indicate high morale). The decision to summate samples was unfortunate. Regional and local variations are great and these variations tended to obscure some significant relationships. An analysis of each population has since been made. The relationship between high national morale on October 1, 1941 and the giving of volunteer work or contribution to Britain or her Allies is indicated by the following bi-serial coefficients: Adults of Pullman, Washington $-.37$, New Hampshire students $-.21$, Midwestern students $-.23$, Smith University students $-.13$, Washington State students $-.10$, Oklahoma A. and M. students $-.37$, Adult Negroes of New Orleans $-.61$. Correlations between bond buying and high national morale at the University of New Hampshire show coefficients of $-.67$ on October 1, 1941 and $-.49$ on February 1, 1942. There is a correlation of low national morale and membership in organizations which protested United States entry into war as of October 1, 1941, $r_{bis} = .51$.

II. *Results of Measurement.* The general trend of national morale between October 1, 1941, and February 1, 1942, is shown by Table 1. Each sample reveals higher national morale, with the University of New Hampshire making the most pronounced shift toward higher morale. (*Low scores on the scale indicate high morale.*) Unfortunately no record could be secured in February for the Midwestern sample. The table reveals four critical ratios, only one of which is high enough to be above the 2.00 level of significance. However, all of the ratios are in the same direction. The probability of occurrence of such differences appearing together can be computed. By appropriate analysis the "multiple" critical ratio can be secured.² For these

where
is the
1941,

WAR DECLARATION AND MORALE OF STUDENTS 633

samples it is +2.98. This means that the odds on finding a pattern of such differences by chance are only one in 345 chances. There is, therefore, little doubt that the outbreak of military activities has increased national morale among these students. The striking increase in the national morale of New Hampshire students, placing this Eastern college in the highest rank, suggests that there may be marked sectional shifts in opinions.

TABLE 1. SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEAN NATIONAL MORALE SCORES AT FIVE AMERICAN COLLEGES BEFORE AND AFTER UNITED STATES ENTRY INTO WAR

	M_1 National Morale Mean Score Oct., 1941	M_2 National Morale Mean Score Feb., 1942	σ_{m_1}	σ_{m_2}	S.E. diff.	C.R.
	$N=100$	$N=96$				
Oklahoma A. & M.	47.59	46.82	7.98	7.08	1.08	+ .71
	$N=90$	$N=112$				
J. C. Smith	49.30	47.13	9.23	8.34	1.25	+1.73
	$N=87$	$N=90$				
New Hampshire	49.83	45.91	8.70	8.10	1.26	+3.11
	$N=100$	$N=82$				
Washington State	50.96	49.33	8.31	7.68	1.18	+1.39
	$N=100$					
Midwestern	54.01	—	—	—	—	—

Multiple C.R. = +2.98; $P=.003$

III. Intensive Study of One Sample. Four time-samples of Washington State students have been taken. These are as of May 1, 1941, October 1, 1941, December 12, 1941, and February 1, 1942. These dates span critical events. Between May and October 1941 the German armies were sent into Russia and nearly engulfed all of Russia's largest cities. On December 12 the United States was still recovering from the shock of the Pearl Harbor disaster and war declarations. Between December 12 and February 1 the people of the United States were being told that they were losing the war as Manila, Malaya, and Singapore fell. Table 2 is a record of the national morale exhibited by Washington State students during these periods. Since low scores on the scale represent high national morale, it is apparent that the events taking place between December 7 and 12 galvanized divergent opinion into a unity which had not existed prior to that time. The military

² Formula for significance of the difference between values for more than two samples is

$$C.R. = \sqrt{\frac{N-1}{N^2} \sum \frac{d_i^2}{e_i}}$$

where d_i is the difference between any two independent values, e_i is its standard error, and N is the number of differences. See. T. C. McCormick, *Elementary Social Statistics*, New York, 1941, pp. 272-273.

TABLE 2. SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEAN NATIONAL MORALE SCORES OF WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE STUDENTS FOR FOUR TIME-SAMPLES

	1	2	3	4
	May 1, 1941 N=100	Oct. 1, 1941 N=100	Dec. 12, 1941 N=85	Feb. 1, 1942 N=82
Mean Score	$M_1=51.77$	$M_2=50.96$	$M_3=48.88$	$M_4=49.33$
Standard deviation	9.72	8.31	7.07	7.68
Critical Ratio		$M_1-M_2=.63$	$M_2-M_3=1.86$ $M_1-M_3=2.35$	$M_2-M_4=-.34$ $M_3-M_4=1.39$ $M_1-M_4=1.85$
Probability		$P_{12}=.53$	$P_{23}=.06$ $P_{13}=.02$	$P_{34}=.73$ $P_{24}=.73$ $P_{14}=.06$

frustrations during December and January, the slowness of our war preparations, and debates over domestic policy did not heighten national morale, but seem to have lowered it slightly.⁴

The item records of the scale are reproduced in Table 3. This table shows the scale items with the minor changes that were made in the wording of some items as the United States entered the war. Such changes do not alter the meaning of the statements except as the entrance of the nation as an active military power changes the meaning. The total percentage of those who marked *strongly agree* or *agree* is placed beside the statement for each of the four time-samples taken at the State College of Washington. All the critical ratios are computed for differences which approach the level of significance. Note that between May and October, 1941, no difference occurred that was statistically significant. However, by December 12, 1941, two pronounced changes in the thinking of the students appeared. There came a greater determination to defeat the Axis nations but also a lowered confidence in their ability to attain desired personal goals. This can be seen clearly in the significant increases to such items as (18) The United States should now, as an ally of Britain, send Air Force, Army, and Navy, if necessary, to defeat Hitler, and (12) No matter how much damage Germany does sooner or later Britain will defeat Hitler. The lower personal morale is exhibited in the increasing agreement to such items as (14) The future looks very black, and (9) The future is too uncertain to make plans for oneself.

Certain accompanying questionnaire results further indicate that the students were emotionally unprepared for the brunt of war which hit so suddenly. In these results we find: (1) 28 percent decrease in those who said that things are going well with them at the present time; (2) 21 percent decrease in those who had previously marked agreement to the question,

⁴ The difference in scale means between December 12, 1941 and February 1, 1942, is not statistically significant and the decrease merely suggests a slight decline.

"Do you think your family members at home feel that they have a regular income during the next year?"; (3) 39 percent increase in those who think the war will force them to leave college before their education is completed.⁶

It becomes clear that shock and uncertainty produced many neurotic symptoms in student behavior during the days immediately following the declaration of war. Two months later much of the excitement and anxiety was gone. On February 1, 1942, we find significantly fewer who say the future looks very black, fewer who say the war will force them to leave college before their education is completed, and more who say that they feel that things are going well with them at the present time.⁸ From the vantage ground which is afforded by the time depth of the experiment, it can be seen that the outbreak of war crystallized the conviction of these students that the Axis nations must be defeated.⁷ They discovered that the threat of a totalitarian government appearing inevitably with our participation in war was a false and misleading belief.⁸ A majority believe that the future is too uncertain to make plans for oneself,⁹ but only about a third believe that the future looks very black.¹⁰ This part of the picture is an encouraging view of national morale among these students. However, no one can afford to overlook the unhealthy currents of thought. Among these currents are to be noted: (1) the belief of an unwavering majority (55 percent) that the British are not so much concerned with the saving of democracy as with the saving of their skins and the rich trade of their empire; (2) seven percent who believe that democracy will collapse no matter what happens in this war (it is encouraging, however, to note a significant decline in this

Questionnaire Items	Response	Wash. State Oct. 1, 1941 N=100	Wash. State Dec. 12 1941 N=85	<i>d</i>	S.E. diff.	C.R.
Do you feel that things are going well with you at the present time?	Yes	80	52	-28	6.74	-4.15
	No or Doubtful	19	48	+29	6.69	+4.45
Do you think your family feel they have a regular income during the year?	Yes	88	67	-21	6.05	-3.47
	No or Doubtful	11	16	+5	—	—
Do you think the war will force you to leave college before your education is completed?	Yes	31	70	+39	6.79	+5.74
	No or Doubtful	63	24	-39	6.69	-5.83

⁶ C.R. = -1.97, $P=.05$; C.R. = -2.15, $P=.03$; C.R. = +1.86, $P=.06$.

⁷ See Table 3, Item 12, Column 16, C.R. = -7.36, $P>.00001$; and Table 3, Item 18, Column 16, C.R. = -7.34, $P>.00001$.

⁸ See Table 3, Item 10, Column 16, C.R. = +4.27, $P>.0001$.

⁹ Table 3, Item 9, Column 16, C.R. = -2.60, $P=.009$.

¹⁰ Table 3, Item 14, Column 16, no significant change.

TABLE 3. RESPONSES OF WASHINGTON STATE STUDENTS AT FOUR SUCCESSIVE TIMES TO THE WASHINGTON STATE SURVEY OF OPINIONS¹

Directions					
READ EACH ITEM CAREFULLY AND UNDERLINE QUICKLY THE PHRASE WHICH BEST EXPRESSES YOUR FEELING ABOUT THE STATEMENT. Wherever possible, let your own personal experience determine your answer. Do not spend much time on any item. If in doubt underline the phrase which seems most nearly to express your present feeling about the statement. WORK RAPIDLY. Be sure to answer every item.					
1. THE BRITISH ARE NOT SO MUCH CONCERNED WITH THE SAVING OF DEMOCRACY AS WITH THE SAVING OF THEIR SKINS AND THE RICH TRADE OF THEIR EMPIRE.	Strongly agree ²	Agree ⁴	Undecided ³	Disagree ²	Strongly disagree ¹
2. NO MATTER WHAT HAPPENS IN THIS WAR, DEMOCRACY WILL COLLAPSE SOONER OR LATER.	Strongly agree ²	Agree ⁴	Undecided ³	Disagree ²	Strongly disagree ¹
3. EVERY ABLE-BODIED SINGLE MAN WHO CALLS HIMSELF AN AMERICAN SHOULD VOLUNTEER NOW FOR MILITARY SERVICE.	Strongly agree ¹	Agree ²	Undecided ³	Disagree ⁴	Strongly disagree ⁵
4. IT IS GOOD TO SEE THE BUSINESS MEN WHO HAVE LEFT PRIVATE BUSINESS GOING TO WASHINGTON TO SERVE THE GOVERNMENT.	Strongly agree ¹	Agree ²	Undecided ³	Disagree ⁴	Strongly disagree ⁵
5. THE MILITARY STRENGTH OF THE UNITED STATES CAN BE ASSEMBLED IN TIME TO GIVE THE ALLIES ENOUGH AID TO DEFEAT HITLER.	Strongly agree ¹	Agree ²	Undecided ³	Disagree ⁴	Strongly disagree ⁵
6. IN MODERN WAR THE AVERAGE SOLDIER IS JUST SO MUCH CANNON FODDER.	Strongly agree ²	Agree ⁴	Undecided ³	Disagree ²	Strongly disagree ¹
7. THERE ARE TOO MANY OLD MEN TRYING TO RUN THE ARMY AND NAVY.	Strongly agree ²	Agree ⁴	Undecided ³	Disagree ²	Strongly disagree ¹
8. ANY MAN OR WOMAN SHOULD BE PROUD TO DIE IN THE DEFENSE OF DEMOCRACY.	Strongly agree ¹	Agree ²	Undecided ³	Disagree ⁴	Strongly disagree ⁵
9. THE FUTURE IS TOO UNCERTAIN TO MAKE PLANS FOR ONESELF.	Strongly agree ²	Agree ⁴	Undecided ³	Disagree ²	Strongly disagree ¹
10. WITHIN SIX MONTHS THE UNITED STATES WILL HAVE A TOTALITARIAN GOVERNMENT.	Strongly agree ²	Agree ⁴	Undecided ³	Disagree ²	Strongly disagree ¹
11. THE UNITED STATES IS A DEMOCRACY IN NAME BUT NOT IN PRACTICE.	Strongly agree ²	Agree ⁴	Undecided ³	Disagree ²	Strongly disagree ¹
12. NO MATTER HOW MUCH DAMAGE GERMANY DOES SOONER OR LATER THE ALLIES WILL DEFEAT HITLER.	Strongly agree ¹	Agree ²	Undecided ³	Disagree ⁴	Strongly disagree ⁵
13. WHITES TREAT THE NEGRO IN THE UNITED STATES WORSE THAN GERMANY TREATS THE CONQUERED PEOPLES OF EUROPE.	Strongly agree ²	Agree ⁴	Undecided ³	Disagree ²	Strongly disagree ¹
14. THE FUTURE LOOKS VERY BLACK.	Strongly agree ²	Agree ⁴	Undecided ³	Disagree ²	Strongly disagree ¹
15. NO ONE CARES WHAT HAPPENS TO YOU.	Strongly agree ²	Agree ⁴	Undecided ³	Disagree ²	Strongly disagree ¹
16. THERE IS NO CHANCE FOR THE LITTLE FELLOW IN BUSINESS ANY MORE.	Strongly agree ²	Agree ⁴	Undecided ³	Disagree ²	Strongly disagree ¹
17. THE REAL AMERICAN SHOULD BE WILLING TO FIGHT FOR HIS COUNTRY WHETHER IT IS IN THE RIGHT OR THE WRONG.	Strongly agree ¹	Agree ²	Undecided ³	Disagree ⁴	Strongly disagree ⁵
18. THE UNITED STATES SHOULD NOW, AS AN ALLY OF BRITAIN, SEND AIR FORCE, ARMY AND NAVY IF NECESSARY TO DEFEAT HITLER.	Strongly agree ¹	Agree ²	Undecided ³	Disagree ⁴	Strongly disagree ⁵

belief between May 1, 1941, and February 1, 1942);¹¹ (3) less than a third (30 percent) who believe any man or woman should be proud to die in the defense of democracy. We turn to an examination of the other samples to make comparisons and seek generalizations that may apply more widely to the college students of the nation.

¹¹ Table 3, Item 2, Column 16, C.R. = +2.29, $P = .02$.

May
194
7%
Agr
N = 1
46
17
21
42
54
63
29
34
37
30
25
35
10
34
19
28
31
22
1 Min
though th
shown as

I
and
Feb
fact
lina,

WAR DECLARATION AND MORALE OF STUDENTS 637

May 1 1941	>			Oct. 1 1941	>			Dec. 12 1941	>			Jan. 27 1942	>			May 1 1942
% Agree N = 100 1	diff. 2	S.E. diff. 3	C.R. 4	% Agree N = 100 5	diff. 6	S.E. diff. 7	C.R. 8	% Agree N = 85 9	diff. 10	S.E. diff. 11	C.R. 12	% Agree N = 82 13	diff. 14	S.E. diff. 15	C.R. 16	% Agree N = 100 17
46	+13	7.00	+1.85	59	-7			52	+3			55	-9			46
17	-7			10	+3			13	-6			7	+10	4.37	+2.29	17
21	-2			19	+8			27	-10			17	+4			21
42	-1			41	-1			40	-1			39	+3			42
54	-7			47	+8			55	+7			62	-8			54
63	-4			59	-4			55	-1			54	+9			63
29	-1			28	-12	6.00	-2.00	16	+7			23	+6			29
34	+3			37	-4			33	-1			30	+4			34
37	+6			43	+19	7.22	+2.63	62	-6			56	-19	7.31	-2.60	37
30	-10			20	-5			15	-8			7	+23	5.39	+4.27	30
25	-3			22	-1			21	+5			26	-1			25
35	+12	6.90	+1.74	47	+18	7.19	+2.50	65	+17	6.69	+2.54	82	-47	6.38	-7.36	35
10	-4			6	-2			4	+9			13	-3			10
34	+4			38	+15	7.26	+2.07	53	-15	7.62	-1.07	38	-4			34
19	-2			17	-3			14	+1			15	+4			19
28	-9			19	-3			16	+7			23	+5			28
31	-8			23	+5			28	+1			29	+2			31
22	+7			29	+42	6.69	+6.28	71	-1			70	-48	6.54	-7.34	22

¹ Minus and plus values of "diff." and "C.R." do not always indicate increased and lowered morale respectively, although the total scale associates low values with high morale. The values assigned to the possible answers to each item are shown as superscripts in the form "strongly agree," etc.

IV. A Comparative Analysis. Five colleges were sampled by questionnaire and scale on October 1, 1941, and four of these samples were re-tested on February 1, 1942 to secure national morale scores and to identify associated factors. These colleges are located in New Hampshire, Indiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Washington. Thus several sections of the country were

sampled. Representativeness was also sought by the inclusion among these of three state schools: the University of New Hampshire, Oklahoma A. and M. College, and the State College of Washington; and two church schools: J. C. Smith University and "Midwestern." The students of J. C. Smith University also provide a sample of the thinking of Negro students in the South. It is believed that these five schools reflect the opinions of the college students of the nation within limits of reasonable accuracy.

A study of the general trend of national morale among these samples showed that all displayed increases between October 1, 1941, and February 1, 1942 (see Table 1). All of these samples demonstrate the great confidence of the students in the military strength of the United States and the belief that the Allied Nations will win. Very large increases in agreement are given to the statements, "No matter how much damage Germany does sooner or later the Allies will defeat Hitler," and "The United States should now, as an ally of Britain, send Air Force, Army, and Navy if necessary to defeat Hitler."¹² There has been a marked decline in agreement to the statement, "Within six months the United States will have a totalitarian government."¹³ On two other statements we find smaller changes, but all the changes are in the same direction and the multiple critical ratios suggest the probability of a significant change in evaluating one's personal role. Uniformly, fewer persons say that "No one cares much what happens to you."¹⁴ In this same pattern is an observed increase in agreement to the statement that "The real American should be willing to fight for his country whether it is in the right or wrong."¹⁵ These responses suggest the influence to which Dr. Robert G. Sproul recently referred, "For the first time, all our people young and old, are hearing the call, 'You are needed'."¹⁶

Accompanying questionnaire responses show that the war has definitely introduced elements of uncertainty in the lives of college students. There is a great increase in the number of students who now feel that the war will force them to leave college before their education is completed.¹⁷ At no school does less than a half of the students expect to complete their education and at New Hampshire 89 percent now expect to leave college before graduation. There is a significant decline among those who say that things are going well with them at the present time.¹⁸ There is, also, a decline among those who say that they think that their family at home feel they have a regular income during the next year.¹⁹

Among the significant changes found for only a given sample are the

¹² Multiple C.R. = +5.91, $P = >.0001$; M.C.R. = +5.91, $P = >.0001$.

¹³ M.C.R. = -4.36, $P = >.0001$.

¹⁴ Multiple C.R. = -2.23, $P = .03$.

¹⁵ M.C.R. = 2.05, $P = .04$.

¹⁶ Address given before the American Association of School Administrators.

¹⁷ M.C.R. = 8.54, $P = >.00001$.

¹⁸ M.C.R. = 4.50, $P = >.0001$.

¹⁹ M.C.R. = 3.52, $P = .0004$.

following: (1) a *decrease* from 37 percent to 15 percent of the J. C. Smith students who agreed that Whites treat the Negro in the United States worse than Germany treats the conquered peoples of Europe (however, over 50 percent say the United States is a democracy in name but not in practice, which is just double the average of all agreements given by white persons to the same statement); (2) the striking *decrease* from 22 percent to 4 percent of New Hampshire students who agreed that no one cares much what happens to you (this decrease is to be observed to a smaller degree in all of the other samples, but the extent of the decrease is much larger in the New Hampshire sample); (3) the large *increase* in the mistrust of the British as is implied in the 63 percent (in October, 42 percent) of Oklahoma students who say that the British are not so much concerned with the saving of democracy as with the saving of their skins and the rich trade of their empire; (4) the significant *increase* in the number of Oklahoma²⁰ students who agree that there is no chance for the little fellow in business any more.

The most discriminating item in the national morale scale is the statement: "Any man or woman should be proud to die in the defense of democracy." The answers to this and other discriminating statements are shown in Table 4. Here it can be seen that there is wide diversity in response. An adult sample of 128 cases secured in the Summer of 1941 from Pullman, Washington; Chicago, Illinois; and Findlay, Ohio, shows a 63 percent agreement to the belief that any man or woman should be proud to die in the defense of democracy. Note that in October only 20 percent of the students of "Midwestern" so agreed and no student group even today has equalled the agreement given by the adults (average age = 42). There has been little change in student opinion on this statement between October and February. Agreement continues to average over 50 percent for the Southern schools and the University of New Hampshire. Washington State College lags with a 30 percent agreement. These samples suggest that the southern and seaboard areas have a greater tendency to make sacrifices than the interior areas. This hypothesis is projected by assuming that the Smith and Oklahoma schools reflect southern attitudes, New Hampshire, the seaboard, and "Midwestern" and Washington State, the interior areas.^{20a}

The response to another discriminating item tends to corroborate this hypothesis. To the statement, "In modern war the average soldier is just so much cannon fodder," "Midwestern" showed 60 percent agreement followed by Washington State with 59 percent agreement. The New Hampshire, J. C. Smith, and Oklahoma students give less agreement, and now, since war has been declared, all have shown decreases until there is only a 41 percent average agreement. The reader must recognize that it is not im-

²⁰ A shift from 17 percent to 34 percent, C.R. = 2.77, $P = .005$.

^{20a} The State College of Washington is located in Eastern Washington. It is only 9 miles from the Idaho boundary and nearly 400 miles from Seattle.

portant whether these respondents take the realistic position. What is important is the latent tendency to act with underlies the answers. The discovery and description of such tendencies provide a basis for inferring

TABLE 4. RESPONSES FROM SIX SAMPLES TO SOME OF THE MOST DISCRIMINATING STATEMENTS OF THE SCALE

Discriminating Scale Statements	Mid-western	Adult Sample	Washington State		Oklahoma A. and M.		New Hampshire		J. C. Smith	
	Oct. 1, 1941 N=100	Summer 1941 N=128	Oct. 1 1941 N=100	Feb. 1 1942 N=82	Oct. 1 1941 N=100	Feb. 1 1942 N=96	Oct. 1 1941 N=87	Feb. 1 1942 N=90	Oct. 1 1941 N=100	Feb. 1 1942 N=112
	Per-centage Agreement	Per-centage Agreement	Percentage Agreement		Percentage Agreement		Percentage Agreement		Percentage Agreement	
1. Any man or woman should be proud to die in the defense of democracy	20	63	37	30	50	49	49	54	56	52
2. In modern war, the average soldier is just so much cannon fodder	60	43	59	54	42	39	57	43	47	40
3. No matter what happens in this war, democracy will collapse sooner or later	7	9	10	7	15	19	14	8	7	11
4. The British are not so much concerned with the saving of democracy as with the saving of their skins and the rich trade of their empire	58	60	59	55	42	63	42	41	43	34
5. There are too many old men trying to run the army and navy	37	37	28	23	27	30	27	29	23	24
6. Whites treat the Negro worse than Germany treats the conquered peoples of Europe	10	11	6	13	5	3	3	7	37	15
7. The United States is a democracy in name but not in practice	33	23	22	26	25	34	17	23	46	55

action and thought patterns. Our interest here is in explaining the variations in responses exhibited by different sections of the nation. We have compared adults and students in a previous study and found no significant variations in mean national morale scores when the students and adults were from the same section.²¹ If we turn to an examination of regions, the results of this study may be fruitfully compared with some of the public opinion polls. Elmo Roper has found on most of his questions for the Fortune Survey that the West North Central States are usually the most pacifist and the West South Central States the most belligerent.²² In general, the South has led all regions of the country in its willingness to fight and go all-out on the war effort. In general, the Midwest, Plains, and Mountain

²¹ Delbert C. Miller, "National Morale of American College Students in 1941," *Amer. Sociol. Rev.*, 7: 194-213, April, 1942.

²² *Fortune*, 25: 109, April, 1942.

States have been least belligerent. The Pacific Coast has responded very much like the Atlantic Coast States. It must be remembered that these poll results have been based largely on pre-war sampling. There is, however, reason to believe that the factors operating then are still influencing opinion.²³ What are the effective causes to explain these variations? Briefly the following hypotheses are suggested:

1. The belligerency of the South is largely explained by those customs of the region which place a higher premium on military endeavor and military effort.²⁴

2. The more pacifist reactions of the Midwest, Plains, and Mountain States result from the feeling of remoteness. In the Mountain and the West North Central States this factor is coupled with a feeling of economic depression. In December, 1941, the Fortune Survey asked the question, "Do you think your son's opportunities to succeed will be better than, or not so good as, those you have?" Results reveal that "the Mountain and West North Central States are unusually pessimistic, showing only a 27 and a 25 percent vote predicting 'better'," (national vote = 37.3 percent.)²⁵ I have no way of knowing whether this economic defeatism is a factor causing the more pacifist reactions, but at the moment, it appears more than coincidental. However, there is no reason to believe that economic factors are always determining. The South is a direct contradiction. Moreover, on the question of their son's opportunities, the majority of Negroes have high hopes.²⁶

3. The Atlantic and Pacific Coast States experience a sense of nearness and immediacy with the World battlefields. The need for holding on to ocean bases from which they might be attacked is recognized and is reflected in their opinions. In a following study these hypotheses will be carefully tested. They stand as tentative explanations placed here for the development of future research.

Variations within the sample introduce new problems. Societal tensions which cannot be ignored are indicated in the answers to the statement of the national morale scale which reads, "No matter what happens in this war democracy will collapse sooner or later." At the present time an average of 11 percent of the college students agree to this statement. Of the same disturbing character are the responses to the statement, "The United States is a democracy in name but not in practice." An average of 25 percent agreement has been given by persons of the white

²³ *Ibid.*, 109.

²⁴ Professor M. E. Thomasson of Smith University, Charlotte, North Carolina, says, "It may be worth mentioning that the pacifist vogue of the twenties and thirties did not have the strength among southern students—Negroes or white people—that it had in some other sections." Letter to the writer, Nov. 20, 1941.

²⁵ Fortune Survey, *Fortune*, 24: 120, December, 1941.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 120.

race, in the samples of Table 4. An average of 50 percent agreement is noted for the Negro students of J. C. Smith University. No one should interpret these responses as indicating a willingness on the part of a substantial minority to abandon democratic government. Intelligent observers will, however, recognize that there is an underlying dissatisfaction represented. Without doubt, some of it is the healthy voice of a progressive people seeking to fulfil the American dream of equality of opportunity for all citizens. Some of it is blind resentment resulting from the bitter frustrations of unhappy economic, marital, social, and other adjustments. It is the role of research to lead the way in a constructive attack by ascertaining the effective causes which lie back of such responses.

Where in our society are the roots of these opinions? Turn to the December, 1941, issue of *Fortune* Magazine and look at the Fortune Survey. This was a poll of public opinion taken just before the outbreak of war. The data are highlighted by these facts. After the war, we will have to work harder, say 73.6 percent of the people with opinions; we will get paid less, say 65.3 percent of the people with opinions; there will be lots of unemployment, say 64 percent of the people with opinions; we will have to pay higher prices say 46.4 percent of the people with opinions.²⁷ Add to these responses the recent returns from a question which had been used in February, 1940. The question was, "Do you think your son's opportunities to succeed will be better than, or not so good as, those you have?" To explain his research results, Roper wrote, "In no breakdown or cross tabulation, in no part of the country or kind of employment or economic level—was there lacking a whopping agreement with the nation's estimate of opportunity that goes onward and upward with the generations."²⁸ In December, 1941, the same question was asked. Interpreting the change in returns which had occurred in the interval, Roper wrote, "—a decline in fundamental optimism that is little short of alarming."²⁹ On the basis of the research data, the following conclusions were written:

The average Nazi may be visualizing his new Order in all its centralized glory, and the average Briton may be dead certain that the post-war world will be an immensely better place to live in, but the average American sees nothing so good as the world he left behind him. Not that he doubts the military outcome of the war. He is overwhelmingly sure of victory in the field. But he foresees defeat at home; even his habitual optimism about his children's opportunities has declined steeply. Doubtless the state of mind helps account for his lingering reluctance to participate in the war as much as he thinks he ought to. Certainly his appetite for the job would be a lot sharper if he could look forward to something more than a few medals when it is all over.³⁰

The people do not feel that war solves economic problems. On the contrary, they see a future made more insecure by the war. The constructive

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 119.

²⁸ Fortune Survey, *Fortune*, 21: 134, February, 1940.

²⁹ Fortune Survey, *Fortune*, 24: 120, December, 1941.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 119.

attack upon these defeatist attitudes is indicated by one of our best known economists. Alvin H. Hansen has recently written,

We do not have to take economic defeat after the military victory is won. . . . We shall have, when the war is over, the technical equipment, the trained and efficient labor, and the natural resources required to produce a substantially higher real income for civilian needs than any ever achieved before in our history. . . . We can achieve a society in which everyone is capable of and willing to work, can find an opportunity to earn a living, to make his contribution, to play his part as a citizen of a progressive, democratic country.³¹

Millions of our citizens do not clearly understand how freedom from want can be achieved. Education has a job to make known what intelligence and cooperative action can achieve in the post-war world.

V. Discussion. An attitude scale is very much like a correlation coefficient in that it gives no answer to the question, "Why does this relationship exist?" Cause must be inferred. We know that back of the answers there are causes operating. To make a penetrating analysis one must get below the level of opinion and identify the value systems which characterize the persons of high and low national morale. So far no systematic research of this character has appeared although many writers have recorded their impressions and observations.³² In a recent article George W. Hartmann has thrown considerable light on the theoretical approach to an analysis of causation behind pacifist and non-pacifist opinion.³³ The approach applies equally well to national morale. His work and mine suggest that the causes for most of the variation in national morale are not accounted for by given group or institutional memberships. The predominant influence of secondary group participation in modern life, coupled to that of the agencies of mass impression, introduces to each person such a wide range of social norms that the values interiorized in personal frames of reference are of great variety. We can tap these values indirectly by searching for those opinions which reveal differing tendencies to act. This study shows quite clearly that some of these values are of deep-seated tenacity, resisting change in the face of war demands. A mistrust of the British continues (an average agreement of 48 percent for item 4, Table 4), a minority of 11 percent continue to believe that no matter what happens in this war democracy will collapse sooner or later, 27 percent are suspicious of the efficiency of the army and navy commands (see item 5, Table 4), and there is no increased opinion that any man or woman should be proud to die in the defense of democracy.³⁴

³¹ Alvin H. Hansen, *After the War—Full Employment*, Washington: National Resources Planning Board, January, 1942, p. 2.

³² One of the most interesting is that of Stanley Washburn, "What Makes Morale," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 5: 519-531, Winter, 1941.

³³ George W. Hartmann, "Motivational Differences between Pacifists and Non-Pacifists," *Jour. Soc. Psychol.*, 14: 197-210, August, 1941.

³⁴ Recently Roper asked the rhetorical question, "What about the traditional American

Some of the opinions given have not been so rigidly tied to deeper attitudes or personal values. One of the striking changes in opinions occurring in all samples was the recognition that the United States could wage war as a democracy and would not necessarily have to resort to a totalitarian government.³⁵ When put to the test this isolationist belief has proved to be a propaganda bogey, and almost all now recognize it as such. In the same fashion, when put to the test of war the Negro students of J. C. Smith University have almost completely denied the assertion that whites treat the Negro in the United States worse than Germany treats the conquered peoples of Europe (see item 6, Table 4). In October, 37 percent of the J. C. Smith students had answered in agreement to this statement. I wrote to Professor Thomasson asking if he could explain why his students should answer in this way. He wrote, "Their checking was, of course, irrational. If they were asked to compare objectively, Hitler's treatment of subject peoples—including the few Negroes in Germany—and America's treatment of Negroes, they would, I am sure admit the irrationality of their checking." The war has objectified the statement and forced the students to come to terms with it. The crust of resentment has been cut through and another value of deeper significance has been touched.

VI. Conclusion. This study of opinions encourages the search for values interiorized within personal frames of reference. Until instruments are constructed to attack with more directness the problem of discovering and describing these values, attitude and opinion scales may be used to interpret and infer the springs to action. This study shows that the entrance of the United States into war touched national pride and galvanized the determination of students and adults to win the war. Many observers recognize that this unity is not yet as firm as could be desired.³⁶ The suddenness of entry linked with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe brought neurotic symptoms to the college community as many students struggled to visualize a reconstruction of habits and goals in a world at war. Most of these symptoms have disappeared but elements of uncertainty remain. The unhealthy aspects of national morale seen most closely attached to insecurity feelings regarding the peace. Here there is a defeatism which, if paralleled on the military side, would be extremely dangerous. The great need seems to be an assurance that the war call, "You are needed," carries forward into the peace. Americans are not yet convinced that democracy can and will manage itself with competence when the military job is finished. Their firm conviction is needed before we shall have the highest national morale.

prejudices?" "They still exist, though it is impossible, without a point of previous reference, to know whether they have increased or declined since the war began." *Fortune*, 25: 110, April, 1942. My results show no significant change except for an increase in mistrust on the part of Oklahoma students.

³⁵ M.C.R. = -4.36, $P = >.0001$.

³⁶ One of the most interesting and penetrating accounts is that of William A. White, "Emporia in Wartime," *New Republic*, 106: 490-492, April 13, 1942.

rura
size
diet
T
men
the
cook
WP
Dep
type
A
labor
grou
*
sored
the U
their
been
advice
earlier
Passin
Rural
of the
factor
1 T
the U
2 S
of Mis
3 S
of Agr
4 S
Social

FOOD AND CULTURE IN SOUTHERN ILLINOIS—A PRELIMINARY REPORT*

JOHN W. BENNETT, HARVEY L. SMITH,¹ AND HERBERT PASSIN

University of Chicago

Northwestern University

Points of interest. How food folkways are being studied to provide guidance for the national nutrition program. What some people eat in the Mississippi River bottoms. What fish means to different social classes. Food and prestige. Food folkways, urbanization, and social change. [Ed.]

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Genesis. Scientific examination of food habits in American rural communities seems to date from the post-World War I period, when a number of modest studies emanated from agricultural colleges and rural sociology departments of state universities.² These studies emphasized the necessity for modifying cooking techniques and food-choices for dietary improvement, and suggested practical techniques for that purpose.

This same tradition persisted in the later attempts of various government agencies, particularly those associated with the wide-scale activities of the Department of Agriculture. Thus NYA has experimented with model cooking projects, Farm Security with garden and canning instruction, WPA with school lunch programs. The Consumer Purchases Studies of the Department of Agriculture represent an elaborate extension of this type of research.³

A second approach to the study of food habits can be seen in the various laboratory studies of the experimental modification of diet in controlled groups, by students of social and child psychology.⁴ In many of these ex-

* This paper is a summary of the operations of the "culture and foodways project," sponsored by the Social Science Research Council and the University of Chicago, at the behest of the USDA (Extension Division) and the Rockefeller Foundation. The authors wish to express their deep obligations to Director M. L. Wilson, of the Extension Division, USDA, who has been the staunchest friend of applied anthropology; to Prof. W. L. Warner, whose unstinting advice proved immensely valuable. The region was selected for the study on the basis of an earlier study of culture changes in the area conducted by the director of the project, Herbert Passin of Northwestern University. (*Vide*, Passin, "Culture changes in Southern Illinois," *Rural Sociology*, forthcoming.) The members of the project and their advisors felt that because of the unique situation studied there, a very full analysis could be made of the many type-factors in the cultural determination of food habits.

¹ The first two authors are associated with the University of Chicago. Mr. Smith is now in the United States Army, Mr. Bennett and Mr. Passin in the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

² See, for example, D. Dickins, *A Study of Food Habits of People in Two Contrasting Areas of Mississippi*, Mississippi Agricultural Experiment Station, Bull. 245, Agric. College, 1927.

³ See *Family Food Consumption and Dietary Levels*, Misc. Public. No. 405, U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1941.

⁴ See K. Duncker, "Experimental Modification of Children's Food Preferences through Social Suggestions," *Jour. of Abnormal and Social Psychol.*, 33: 489-507, 1938.

periments food was utilized as a medium for the demonstration of certain psychological propositions, and the end *per se* cannot be said to have been a remedial change in food habits.⁶

In recent years interest in food habits has tended to emphasize the essential involvement of diet and foodways within the total cultural configuration, and the obvious significance of this for remedial programs. Although rural sociologists have investigated dietary-cultural situations,⁶ a considerable share of the credit must go to British social anthropologists, who at a relatively early period were envolving a theoretical systematization of diet and culture from data gathered in Africa.⁷ This general approach does more than merely introduce the concept of "culture" to the field; it essentially points up the necessity for considering extra-physiological factors in the selection, production, and preparation of human foods. The illusion of an "economic man," searching out the most obscure foodstuffs from an unwilling Nature in the reasoned pursuit of complete fulfillment of his needs, must give way to the concept of a man conditioned by the preferences and prejudices of his neighbors, selecting only those foods sanctioned by the "culture." And since these prejudices and preferences are not fortuitous, but rather products of certain social processes, modificatory programs must deal with the controls and mechanisms of these processes.

The Southern Illinois Foodways Study took this point of view into the field, and subjected it to an empirical investigation.

Purposes. These were twofold: (1) To make a preliminary isolation of certain general propositions concerning the involvements of food habits with culture, and (2) to evolve a set of procedures or specific techniques for the modification of food habits in the area studied; and which would also serve as a working basis for similar programs in other segments of American rural society. The study was thus both practical and theoretical; specific and general.

Nutritional aspects of diet were investigated only in terms of relatively generalized features. The field party lacked the services of a trained nutritionist, but even had one been present, the length of the study would have prohibited a properly intensive investigation. It is doubtful if informants

⁶ These studies by laboratory researchers merge into large-scale programs of modification by University and public clinics. The work of the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station is an excellent example of practical and theoretical pursuits; similarly the University of Minnesota and the Department of Home Economics of the City of St. Paul, Minnesota, have developed both ends of the undertaking. (Summaries of various aspects of the work of these groups can be found in *Conference with the Committee on Food Habits* (held in Washington, June 27-28, 1941). Mimeographed, National Research Council.

⁶ See M. L. de Give and M. T. Cussler, *Interrelations Between the Cultural Pattern and Nutrition*. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Extension Service Circular 266, August, 1941.

⁷ The classical example is, of course, Audrey Richards' *Land, Labor and Diet in Southern Rhodesia*, London, 1938, and the Vol. IX, No. 2 (1936) issue of *Africa*, in which the basic concepts and procedures of such investigations were established.

would have cooperated to the extent required for nutritional studies. However, a considerable body of gross data was acquired—enough to indicate the most prominent dietary deficiencies in the various areas. These were present in sufficient degree to demonstrate the advisability of attempts at change.

Hypotheses. The structure of the investigation was given a preliminary alignment by the point of view expressed above, under "Genesis." Thus: Men utilize and exploit the natural environment only to the extent allowed them by their customs and traditions. Between human beings and food-stuffs in the natural environment there exists a cultural screen, which modifies and controls the selection of available foods.

This approach may be phrased as a simple *a priori* resolution: Food habits are to be considered as part of the general cultural milieu. It is therefore assumed they are integrated within social and economic systems.

Supplementary to this are a series of procedural hypotheses, grouped under the general statement: Food habits can be modified by the manipulation of the social systems in which they are integrated. Thus as a corollary of the integration of food habits within culture, it was observed that food could be studied as one of a series of indices of various types of change within the culture. In the subareas of the region the authors found food could be used as an indicator of acculturation, status and prestige, urbanization, and other "social processes."⁸ Further, it was found that along with certain changes in economic or social systems occurred concomitant shifts of food habits. Thus the introduction of WPA in the area has led to a greater proportion of cash expenditures for food, since WPA work replaces the time ordinarily spent in cultivating a garden.⁹ The direction of food changes was carefully developed, since these gave clues to just what new foods might be introduced in ways that would give a reasonable assurance of successful modification.

Some of these various principles, phrased as hypotheses, can be considered as suitable for testing in further field investigations. For example: If food is identified with sub- or superordination within a socio-economic system, it will acquire prestige values related to the classes or social groups participating in the mobile structure.

The Region. The study was confined to one county and part of a second in a river-bottom and upland region in southern Illinois. The region had the following ecological divisions:

- a. The River. A major stream, marking the border between Illinois and another

⁸ A recent paper by Cora du Bois ("Attitudes Toward Food and Hunger in Alor," in *Language, Culture, and Personality*—Sapir Memorial Volume, 1941) illustrates some aspects of the use of food as an indicator of cultural drives, basic logics, and typical personality types.

⁹ A tendency toward greater reliance upon a cash economy had, of course, already appeared much earlier than the introduction of WPA. The later organization has served to intensify and maintain the dependence upon purchased goods.

state. Dammed for flood control, but with sufficient fish to provide a meager living for shantyboat dwellers and riverbank squatters.

b. The Riverbank. A region of exceptional fertility, immediately bordering the stream, and occupied by small families or individuals living as squatters with permission on farmland, and making a living by fishing and/or farm labor.

c. The Bottoms. A low, flat area, marking the former channels of the river. Dissected by sloughs, and subject to frequent floodings. Flora is primarily deep South—constitutes an ecological island in this more typical northern country. Occupied by large tenant farmers and marginal sub-sharecroppers; WPA families; farm laborers. Area (b), the Riverbank, is really the southern margin of the Bottoms. Soil very fertile.

d. The Lower Hills. The first river terrace northward from the Bottoms. An area of low, rolling hills, composed of unfertile clay soil. Occupied by small farm owners who frequently rent land in the eastern end of the Bottoms, outside the tenant farmer group. Entirely different family lines are represented here, and there are few social contacts with the Bottoms dwellers.

e. The Northeast Hills. A high, rolling semi-forest area east of the Lower Hills area. Soil poor and badly eroded. Inhabited by marginal, relief, and Farm Loan farming families. Many of the tenants and sharecroppers in the Bottoms came from this area.

f. The Upper Hills and German Hills. A higher upland area north of the Lower Hills. Is geographically continuous with Northeast Hills. Soil poor, but good agricultural techniques have preserved it from depletion and erosion. Inhabited by relatively well-off farmers—representing highest economic group in whole region. Divided into two sub-areas as noted above: relative lack of contact between "English" group and Germans—also considerable culture differences. Some acculturation taking place.

g. Stringtown. A small crossroads village located toward the western edge of the Bottoms, and constituting a focus for the Lower Hills, western Bottoms, and to some extent the Upper Hills. The town is a typical example of an urbanized and WPA-ized rural community. Bootlegging during Prohibition gave it a tremendous boom and permanently removed its residents from the farm.

h. Negro Communities. These two settlements were located along the road going through Unionville across the Bottoms. One represented one of the oldest communities in the area, and was populated by older individuals. The other was a younger settlement, with an active church and social life. Both had their own Negro schools. Labor from each is hired by White farmers. At one time a few colored farmers owned considerable land in the Bottoms.

Coincident with these natural-human ecological areas were found rather distinct sub-cultures of the total regional culture. These sub-cultures were studied as interacting social units with processes of interaction most intense within each sub-culture, and less intense between the groups. More will be said of this interactive structure relative to food later in the paper.

It should be noted here that the recognition of these sub-cultural groupings within a general regional society constitutes one of the more important

com
elid
nut
of f
thes
thro

T
surv
obse
Hills
siste
the F
In
cover
cont
beca
done
techn
and
evalu
comp

The
lems
field
uniqu
weekly
ceede
cogen

Dur
inform
examp
garden
posol,
plexes
and int

The
as basi

¹⁰ A c
mitted to
Food Hal

contributions of the study. Previous dietary level analyses have tended to elide such divisions, grouping the data in terms of abstract economic or nutritional units. Highly significant differences in food habits and relation of foodways to social and economic systems were found to coincide with these sub-cultures, even though a basically similar dietary level existed throughout the region.

METHODOLOGY AND TECHNIQUES

The Interview. A short-term field program (3 months) plus a large-scale survey analysis necessitated an interview technique rather than participant observation. Field workers lived with the families of one sub-area (Lower Hills) and were thus able to observe food habits in these families. No consistent observation was made by those workers not directly concerned with the Hills area, however.

Interviews were initially developed by the use of an outline questionnaire covering relevant social and economic information within a subsistence context. These forms were modified after first trials. When interviewers became acquainted with their informants, these questionnaires were abandoned, save for reference, and both directed interviews and free-association techniques were substituted. Later in the study food-prestige, preference, and historical-change summary lists were prepared, in order to secure evaluative responses from informants. Such devices as the familiar paired-comparison technique were utilized.

These various questionnaires and tests were modified according to problems met in various subareas. Toward the close of the study, each of the field workers had achieved an orientation toward problems more or less unique for each of the areas. The accumulating field material, analyzed weekly, thus provided its own conceptual organization as the study proceeded. For example, the problem of culture contact was seen to be most cogent in the Upper Hills; food prestiges were stressed for the Bottoms.

During the course of the study various short-cuts for securing concise information were developed. Quantitative and other data, it was found for example, could be gathered quickly in the interview situation by naming a garden crop, then asking the informant to give planting times, yield, disposal, table preparation, medicinal value, etc. If significant attitudinal complexes were seen emerging, these could be followed immediately, or noted and introduced in another interview.¹⁰

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The Dietary Pattern. Content of the diet in all subareas can be considered as basically similar. The three staples, potatoes, beans, and pork, were

¹⁰ A compilation of these various field techniques and general methodology has been submitted to Director M. L. Wilson of the USDA. Extension Division and the Committee on Food Habits of the NRC.

common to all groups, and were culturally traditional in all. The German diet was founded on a similar triad of staples, but in this case it had been a European importation. Moreover the use and preparation of these three foods differed in the German and English groups. A somewhat similar control was at hand for the River and Bottoms, where a shantyboat river-dweller with varied cultural experiences also had the most unique diet for this general region. Again, the staples and content were traditional, but methods of preparation varied.

Some of the traditional and most frequently encountered foods for the region as a whole may be grouped here by meal-type:

- Breakfast:* Flour and/or meat-grease gravy
Fried eggs
Strips of fat pork, fried
Water or milk biscuits
Preserved fruit (jam or jelly)
Coffee (with cream or canned milk)
- Dinner:* Boiled or fried potatoes
Cooked dried beans
Cooked (with meat grease) green or lima beans
Boiled pork or fried fat pork
Sliced fresh tomatoes
Fresh lettuce, served "wilted" with vinegar
Macaroni with tomatoes
Pie or cake
Coffee (with cream or canned milk)
- Supper:* Food from dinner is usually allowed to stand in the dishes until supper time, when it is either warmed over or served cold. Occasionally fresh meat or potatoes may be fried, or fresh tomatoes sliced.

Children are usually given a glass of skimmed milk with each meal. In the more affluent families, the children may receive whole milk, but this was relatively infrequent. It can be seen from this brief list that the diet as a whole is over-plentiful in carbohydrates and fats; fresh leafy vegetables are little used, and when served are prepared in such a way as to destroy certain essential vitamin content. The excessive use of meat greases and fats, however, may introduce the fat-soluble vitamins.

Diet variation by economic level was at a minimum during the summer, when families on all levels and areas ate garden produce from home-tended plots. In the winter, however, differences seem to be pronounced, in that the families on the lower economic levels are forced to consume their own home-canned fruits, vegetables, and meat exclusively, while the higher income groups can buy fresh foods when needed. In the Bottoms the situation could be observed in the correlation between well-planted, well cared-for gardens with high yields, with the lower income families. Also

more attention was paid to canning supplies and techniques in these families.

In general, members of lower income levels in all subareas consumed less meat, eggs, and milk. Even if cattle and chickens were present on share-cropper or Farm Loan farms, it was necessary to sell the products to eke out bare living expenses. Families engaged in non-agricultural pursuits, such as fishing, probably had the least meat, eggs, milk, and fresh vegetable content of any diet, although the data relative to this situation are still incompletely analyzed.

To a certain extent it was necessary for families on the higher levels of the agricultural population to sell dairy and poultry products in order to secure enough cash for household and personal expenditures. In many cases, particularly in the Bottoms, much of this money was used for the purchase of relatively expensive luxury articles of food or clothing which carried high prestige values in the mobile status structure.

In summary, the dietary pattern of the whole region is basically uniform, with subareal variations in content and modes of preparation. A chronic shortage of certain "protective" foods, such as milk and fresh vegetables, seems to exist. Differences by economic level may appear seasonally, as a result of the reliance upon home gardens, and the greater supply of cash in the higher income groups.

The preceding remarks apply generally to the "Old American" families of the region, whose diets reflect a basic southern rural tradition. Within the German division of the Upper Hills area, however, a somewhat different dietary background was found. The "beans, potatoes and pork" staple triad was present, only in this case it reflected an Old Country tradition. Furthermore, the Germans raised better gardens and accomplished more home canning than the other groups; pork was less emphasized, though important, and beef was a relatively frequent part of the diet. Other items of the German diet that appear rarely or not at all elsewhere are: various kinds of soups, cottage cheese, rye bread, pickled vegetables, head-cheese, buttermilk, liverwurst, and others. The most strikingly unique article in their diet is blood-sausage or "blood-pudding," made from the blood of slaughtered hogs. This is a low prestige item and is generally spoken of with disgust by the Old American groups.

In general, the German diet was more consistent and homogeneous than the pattern for other Hills area families. This seems to reflect the greater stability and homogeneity of the German Hills culture.

Modes of Change. Preliminary analysis of the data has indicated that it will be convenient to discuss the topic of change in terms of variations from a "core" diet. Thus we might conceptualize (in addition to the core diet) the following: the "secondary core diet," consisting of the recent introduc-

tion of many store-purchased foods; and the "peripheral diet," comprising even more recent innovations stimulated by special economic conditions.

The core diet is equivalent to the potatoes-beans-pork basic diet, mentioned earlier, and the various modes of preparation of these foods. To the "core" context, however, must be added a number of other traditional items, like macaroni, tomatoes, biscuits, jams and jellies, turnip greens, etc. These foods also can be regarded as surviving elements of the older dietary pattern associated with the "pioneer" period of small, self-supporting farms. In this older period, which terminated about 1910, were included many foods which have since disappeared or become rare. Thus beef was a generally-utilized food in the Bottoms until the sale of beef cattle became profitable; it survives at present in the German area only. In other areas, where no beef cattle were raised, beef was purchased in the old days. It has disappeared in these areas, too.

The evidence favors the conclusion that this old pattern contained a more nutritive diet than the present: the use of unrefined flour, lean meats, home-raised eggs and milk, and a greater use of garden and wild greens are some of the more consistent interview reports.

With the disappearance of local corn and wheat flour mills, and the gradual introduction of the cash crop system in regard to both corn and cattle, a greater dependence upon purchased staples became evident. This might be called the secondary core diet. Pork (primarily fatty cuts) was also substituted for beef, since hogs were easier to raise and commanded a smaller market price. Corn bread has almost disappeared, since the corn mills are gone, and corn flour is relatively expensive. "Light bread," or ordinary white bread has supplanted the whole wheat varieties of the old pattern. Fruits are ordinarily purchased at present, whereas in the "old days" they were raised in local orchards and secured by bartering eggs or chickens, or other produce. A few "luxury" items have also become frequent enough to be considered as part of this secondary core diet, such as corn flakes and candy bars.

The changes discussed above may be related to the general economic and social shift called "urbanization." The transition to a cash crop economy in American agriculture was necessarily accompanied by greater dependence on local urban markets, and the self-supporting phase of farming life declined.

Foods in the "peripheral diet" can be classified in two divisions: (1) those introduced very recently, like potted meats, store cookies, sausage, and the like; (2) foods that are beyond the financial limits of the population, but which may be purchased whenever a little extra money can be found. Thus a farm laborer in the Bottoms cultivated a taste for oysters, and bought some in town whenever he could; canned goods are bought by all families if their own supply is depleted or if a particular "cravin" is developed. A

number of socio-economic processes have stimulated this type of change: WPA affected the use of canned meats and other sandwich-lunch preparations, since the men have to carry their noon meal. Itinerant laborers may eat in restaurants or on government river boats, and then introduce their newer tastes to the area when they return to become sharecroppers or farm workers.

It is perhaps obvious that many of the prestige foods lie in the area of this peripheral diet, since many of them represent expensive, hard-to-get items, associated with a higher economic level. This was at least the case in the Bottoms, Stringtown, and the Lower Hills.

In general, dependence on purchased foods is increasing throughout the area, particularly in subareas with urban contacts, like the Northeast Hills, the Lower Hills, and Stringtown. In the Bottoms the tenant farmers remain close to the self-support level, since they have chickens, pork, and milk from beef cattle. The sharecroppers and farm laborers, however, must buy these items if they wish them at all. Riverbank squatters without adequate gardens rely on stores to a very large degree. The single shantyboat family had no garden, and bought nearly all of its food. An important differential in this pattern might be examined more closely: this is the tendency for tenant farmers to buy more store canned-goods, fruits, and breads, and less meat, canned milk, and the like; sharecroppers and farm laborers will emphasize the garden, and buy less canned goods and fruits, bake their own breads, but buy nearly all their meat and milk.

In the Northeast Hills we find an increasing dependence on the stores and a breakdown in home-production which reflect the fact that soil erosion has literally washed away the economic base of this group. Government money through Farm Loan and WPA have put these people midway between a "farming" and a "money" economy, as has the increasing source of income for the area from farm labor. Their food pattern reflects this condition: they are midway between living off the farm and buying all their food in town.

The German area displays changes which can be ascribed to all these various factors, plus others: specific urban contacts of an order more intense than in other areas, since many young townspeople have married and settled in the Hills; and a general process of social and biological Americanization, as a result of the gradual blending with the Old American groups. The Old Country foods and dishes, like blood-sausage, are used by the older people. These will pass away when the old people die, since the younger generations "have no time" for the detailed techniques required for their preparation. The taboo placed upon such dishes by the Old Americans has also operated toward their removal.

Perhaps to be included in the secondary core, but reserved here for special treatment since our analysis is at present incomplete, are the various high-

prestige foods used for ceremonial occasions. Potato, bean, and salmon salad, boiled ham, roast turkey and chicken, and others are made for church suppers, holidays, and during visits by the preacher, but never appear on the table on ordinary days. Some of these foods are expensive, but the majority are merely fancy preparations of staple items. Their infrequent use helps to preserve their prestige value.

These foods are to be distinguished from certain often-used items, like meat grease and fish, which in certain contexts acquire prestige weightings according to their value as indicators, for example, of farming as against fishing status.

Other sources of change in food habits have been investigated, but space does not permit full discussion. Schools, for example, were found to have little effect along dietary lines. A number of young people admitted they had received training in home economics and cooking, but the evidence showed they never followed the teaching. The only case showing such ideas remaining after marriage was that of a young woman who had worked in town as nursemaid for a wealthy family, which required her to prepare infants' food and help with the cooking—according to the scientific methods she had learned in school.

Food and the Social Processes. It was noted earlier in the paper that toward the close of the field study the accumulating data for each subarea had been seen to adhere in a particular configuration, which was given special study by the workers. We shall give below a very brief presentation of some of these alignments of field material. These data also represent a conceptualization of some of the more specific principles and mechanisms discussed under "Modes of Change," above.

1. *Status and Prestige in Relation to Foodways in the Bottoms.* In this subarea it was found that food in general had unusually low affect in regard to its consideration as something-to-eat. Few ideas or concepts of the nutritional side of eating were found; little homogeneity was present in the few that were found. Moreover, food and foodways were reduced to a reflex level—no provisions for the transmission of food ideas were present; the lack of female companionship and a female social organization reduced food to a non-communicable level. This general negative attitude (or rather, lack of any consistent attitude) was found in all socio-economic levels: shantyboat dwellers, riverbank squatters, farm laborers, WPAers, sharecroppers and tenant farmers.

Another type of interest in food soon became evident, however. Certain food items were mentioned in contexts of envy, desire to move upward in the hierarchy of social status, emulation of a superordinate level, and similar situations indicative of high or low prestige values. These attitudes could be related to the particular status system in the Bottoms: an emulation of and desire to achieve the tenant-farmer level by all families placed in an

economic and/or social subordination to this upper level. The single exception to this desire for mobility was the shantyboat-dweller: he insisted his diet was distinctive of his unique status as a riverman, and that it distinguished him from the agricultural population.

Thus riverbank squatters living by fishing speak proudly of their "farm food"; sharecroppers interested in reaching the tenant status assured the investigator that they ate just like the farmers; the marginal individuals in general apologize for their "poor" food and state that "some day we'll be eatin' like regular folks." One riverbank squatter declared that the "wealthy" farmers in the Hills were the finest people in the neighborhood, and that "they was fine fellers fer a human way of livin' and eatin'."

The general rule seems to be that if one can eat like the group he aspires towards, he has a right to identify with that group. One sharecropper midway between itinerant-labor and farm-tenancy felt that food was his most important link with the tenant group, and used it as a symbol of identification with that group.

The interesting reality of the situation is that qualitatively there are few or no dietary differences in these various status and economic levels—the variation is all in terms of quantity and seasonal supply. The sharecropper mentioned above had a meagre diet identical to that of a riverbank fisherman nearby, although he repeatedly emphasized how much better he ate than this latter family. The shantyboat-dweller's food differed from the farm diet only in a few relatively minor variations in methods of food-preparation.

It follows that certain foods will express this value of identification in different ways, having high or low prestige connotations. One of the most interesting of these is fish, and a brief analysis of its ramified meanings follows.

To the fisherman, fish represents a means to a living, and he concentrates on catching and selling all he can get. The fisherman proudly states, "Why we fishermen don't eat much fish. We eat less than most people. We have to sell all we can git." This reaction is especially acute if the fisherman is tied symbiotically to the owner or renter of a farm, but it was even displayed by the shantyboat-dweller. The essential fact here is that fish is a low prestige food, and this feeling is present even in the fishing group—regionally the most generally distrusted and despised group.

To the farm laborer or sharecropper, striving toward the tenant level, fish represents a low-class food, eaten only by "them river rats" and not fit for human consumption, in spite of the fact that the people do eat fish frequently.

On the tenant farming level these reactions are less conspicuous. Fish is not eaten because "the woman don't like to cook it," and because "somehow we jest never seem to git down to the river to buy none." Fish is dismissed

rather carelessly as an unimportant subject, and the investigator receives the impression that it is a vulgar food not usually eaten by "nice folks."

It is understandable why reactions to fish should involve so much rationalization and ambivalence—fish must be and is eaten (as a necessary food by the lower economic levels), in spite of the strong negative valuations applying to it.

A modest generalization may be postulated: Wherever reactions of various sorts to a specific food are especially widespread, and keep recurring, one may look for a conflict between its status value and the necessity or tradition of its inclusion in the diet.

Some specific foods and dishes assume stereotyped imagery as representing the general solidarity of the Bottoms versus the Outside. Thus, blood-pudding is a general symbol of revulsion and contempt for "them Germans in the Hills"; the eating of muskrats has come to symbolize the animal-like habits of Negroes; fish itself symbolizes the low status of "river rats," although in this case the food is actually eaten by those who use it opprobriously.¹¹

2. Culture Contact and Food Habits in the Hills. In the general Hills area, the specific orientation of field problems centered around the differentials of culture change resultant from varying types of acculturation and culture-contact. Food habits were found to be involved in status, but this feature was relatively unimportant; whereas in the Bottoms any program for dietary modification must first consider the status system, in the Hills conditions of culture-contact must be manipulated.

In the Northeast Hills was found increasing dependence on store foods and a breakdown in home production, as a result of the impact of relief, WPA, Farm Loan, and the practice of "hiring out" as farm labor to Lower Hills farmers. The group as a whole may be considered as transitional between a cash and an agricultural economy.

In the Lower Hills dependence on stores was also becoming prominent, but in this case it was a result of aspirations toward urban middle class standards brought about by a consistent urbanization. These families have developed considerable contact with the Farm Bureau in town; greater mobility (through cars) and a desire for such urban conveniences as electric refrigerators have led to changes in food habits.

In the Upper Hills, culture-contact between the German families and the prosperous Old American groups has led to a process of acculturation in which the German food habits have gradually been modified in accordance with Old American standards. The "Old Country foods" are disappearing

¹¹ The term "river rats" is never applied by Bottoms residents to fishermen or squatters within the local social nucleus—only to those living elsewhere on the riverbank. Thus riverbank fishermen in the Bottoms may use the term to describe the other fishermen living near a river town in the area!

under the pressure of outside taboos and the disappearance of knowledge in the younger generations. In addition to this type of change, urbanization has also been operative, both generally, as in the case of the Lower Hills, and specifically, in that the Germans have an unusually large number of close relatives living in town.

In the Bottoms, contact with outside cultures could be held relatively constant, since the personality-type of the area was typically that of an individual who had tried many jobs in other regions, before living in the Bottoms. Thus a general level of urbanization could be assumed, and the data indicate this was fairly uniform for all families. This situation manifestly differs from the Hills, where important variables in outside contact were evident.

Negroes and Their Food. The economic status of the Negroes differs substantially from that of the neighboring whites. Few Negroes own more than an acre of land, the largest holding in Shady Grove being 20 acres, and the largest in Black Bottoms being approximately 87 acres. For the bulk of the Negro population, landlessness is the primary condition of life.

The land in the possession of most of the Negroes is poor, scrubby soil, among the very poorest in the county, and does not have a large yield. Some families have one or two fruit trees, although some of the larger farmers in Black Bottoms occasionally have substantial orchards.

By comparison with that of the whites, the total gardening tends to be slight. The care of the growing plants is considerably more casual. This all leads to the inevitable suggestion that the Negroes, on the whole, are less dependent upon their gardens and more dependent upon the local stores. Here, as is clear in Stringtown, two distinct modal attitudes are found to exist. The older persons and the better farmers have as their goal a maximum of self-sufficiency for food. Younger farmers and those more directly dependent upon Government relief pay much less attention to their gardens and their ideal is to have sufficient money to buy all they need in the stores. Hence the garden is of minor importance, attitudes toward it more casual, and the yield far below their needs. In part this division of attitudes corresponds to substantial differences both in economic status and in the extent to which they have been subjected to urban influences.

In addition to the garden source of foods, the Negroes have recourse to various wild foods. The regularity with which they gather various types of berries makes these very similar to agricultural products in their reliability in the diet. Wild plants which are regularly collected in the appropriate seasons include grapes, polk, elderberry, wild mustard, strawberries, dewberries, blackberries, broom sage, berry briar, and various docks. In the Bottom country different types of nuts are gathered, including hickories and pecans, stored for future use and even occasionally sold. Dandelion is used for boiled greens, wine, and stock feed.

Most Negroes are very fond of hunting and, both in and out of season, this provides substantial additions to the meat larder. The most common wild game are squirrel, rabbit and quail. These appear regularly on the table during late summer and fall. Squirrel is sometimes canned and put up for the winter, but most persons feel that there is too little meat to warrant the expenditure of energy. To these fairly staple wild game must be added wild geese, wild duck, possum, coon, turtle, muskrat, frog, rats and mice. The eating of rats is looked down upon by Whites and even by many Negroes. It seems likely that rats were probably eaten more extensively in the past but that with the introduction of new food ideas their use decreased considerably. Apparently they represent a dire poverty food, the use of which many do not like to admit. On the other hand, the owner of the largest holding in Black Bottoms told us with great pride that he liked to eat rats, "especially the big ones," because he said they have lots of good meat on them. Defensively he added that "the crib squirrels" were cleaner than chickens.

Since the resources of the total Negro community are meagre, most of the deficit has to be made up in store purchases. It is clear from the records that although Negroes derive less from their gardens than Whites do, and although Negroes have smaller cash incomes than Whites, their store purchase is proportionately higher to total food income than is to be found among Whites. This is a significant difference between the two racial groups. Of course even within the Negro community there are differences in this regard. Corresponding to the division earlier indicated, that is, between farmers and those dependent on Government aid, we find that the latter group depends more largely on store purchase for its food. Among these, store purchases are made with relative frequency, sometimes as often as every two or three days, more often once a week. For the more conservative group, purchases are made at intervals of from two weeks to a month.

CONCLUSIONS

Theoretical Summary. From the meagre outline presented above, it can be seen that a number of significant approaches to the study of food habits have emerged from the study. Viewing the materials purely from the standpoint of the culture scientist, the relevance of food and foodways as indices to the social structure, social status, culture change, and economic status is apparent. The study of techniques and attitudes surrounding the production and consumption of food in any culture can lead to important analyses of the basic attitudinal sets and social processes at work in the cultural situation. The elaborate implementation of the concept of "urbanization" in this region was derived strictly from leads acquired during the study of food and the subsistence economy. This point may be particularly true for rural and the so-called "primitive" societies, where subsistence is a rela-

tively more important pursuit than in the larger urban communities. Rationalizations and ambivalences surrounding food in simpler societies are more commonly shifted to material possessions and personal behavior in urban culture.

If the data are viewed from the standpoint of applied social science, however, the problem of change is seen to be uppermost. For these purposes the production and consumption of food are regarded in terms of (1) frequencies, time and method of introduction, and (2) of the social processes affecting the use of a given food. Thus concrete leads can be developed for the constructive modification of food habits.

Attitudes and the social processes, however, are fully as important for practical purposes as the mechanisms and techniques. No remedial program could succeed without manipulating status situations, types of cultural interconnections, and conflicting and alternative value-systems. Thus both the theoretical and applied approaches deal with essentially similar materials.

Recommendations. Two types of programs for constructive change in food habits can be briefly sketched. (1) An over-all socio-economic plan could be made involving both direct and indirect approaches to problems of subsistence. This plan might be constructed in the form of a resettlement program or cooperative farming project, geared to eliminate the absentee-landlord system in the Bottoms, and permit a soil-revivification program in the Hills. The plan might be organized in terms of the entire region, or merely for one area. The essential feature of this type of plan in regard to food habits is the approach to the fundamental economic and social controls affecting food preferences and preparations. In the Bottoms, for example, cooperative resettlement might help to alleviate the exhausting individualistic striving and thereby divert diet from the rigid channels of prestige.

(2) The second type of remedial plan might be a more or less short-term campaign for dietary modification utilizing all available sources of contact with the people. NYA, for example, might intensify cooking projects, which could be integrated with school lunch programs and high school home economics instruction. The Surplus Commodities Corporation could introduce a program of systematic instruction in balanced choice among its distributed foods. Local merchants might cooperate in a promotional campaign to stimulate interest and sales in whole wheat products, lean meats, and other foods. Window displays in stores might be linked with cooking and dietary projects in the schools. Merchants with regular delivery services to the rural areas could be utilized as direct contacts for promotional devices. The local Farm Bureau might be utilized for extensional services in dietary instruction, adding to its present agricultural advisory function.

Many existing attitudes could be utilized as operating bases upon which to construct new food ideas. Thus the prevalent favorable attitude toward

patent medicines in the area could be easily manipulated to include vitamin preparations. These could be sold by local drug stores or travelling merchants, who would use techniques similar to those already in use by manufacturers of patent medicines, omitting, of course, the extravagant claims for cure.

These various techniques, in addition to many others of a similar nature, could be controlled as a unified experimental project. The personnel of such an undertaking should include social scientists, administrators, and advisors for promotional and advertising methods.

The direction and organization of such a program would necessarily be guided by the specific information upon food habits secured during the field study. Frequencies of food choices and preparations, methods and times of introductions, and the direction by which further introductions can take place would comprise the basic data. Manipulation of specific foods or food habits would then be aligned in accordance with the attitudes and social processes affecting their integration within the culture.

Notice. Sociologists who are conducting research on food habits or attitudes, or who would be willing to organize opinion-sampling squads or student research projects dealing with nutrition, rationing, etc., might be helpful by communicating with the Committee on Food Habits, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Ave., Washington, D. C., Margaret Mead, Executive Secretary. Also, certain reports in this field may be available for distribution.

SOCIOLOGY IN AMERICAN COLLEGES

RAYMOND KENNEDY AND RUBY JO REEVES KENNEDY

Yale University

Vassar College

Points of interest. Definite answers to many questions asked about sociology by our faculty colleagues. A logical classification of sociology courses and the frequency of each. Some keen observations of the attitudes of other scholars toward sociology and the development of our science in college curricula. [Ed.]

TWO YEARS ago one of the authors of this article became involved in a discussion concerning expansion of the undergraduate sociology courses offered by his department. As so often happens in questions of this kind, the conversation turned into a debate over what sociology is and what subject matter it may properly consider its own. One approach to an answer seemed to be an inquiry into what sociologists actually teach in their main field of pedagogical endeavor, the undergraduate colleges. Random perusal of a number of college catalogues resulted more in raising than in answering questions. One might report, for instance, that such and such courses appeared to be most prevalent, only to be challenged by the remark that although this may be true in some areas of the country, it may not be so elsewhere, or that women's colleges differ from men's in certain respects, and so on. Finally, it was decided that a survey of all sociology courses, or at least a wide sample of them, would be the best means of getting a true answer to the question—an answer phrased in terms of the statement: "Sociology is what sociologists teach."

The study was begun in the latter part of 1939 and continued through the summer of 1941.¹ The catalogues used were those of the academic years 1939-40 and 1940-41.² In all, 607 colleges were included. The criteria of selection were as follows: only universities, colleges and teachers colleges offering full four-year curricula were surveyed; all courses listed in the undergraduate sociology departments were included. If an institution had no sociology department, its catalogue was searched for sociology courses given under the auspices of some other department, and these were also included. Junior colleges, two-year normal schools, graduate schools, and other professional schools were excluded. In a few instances it was necessary to omit otherwise acceptable institutions because of inability to secure full information concerning them.

Our sample of 607 covers 65.1 percent of the 928 four-year colleges listed

¹ The authors acknowledge with thanks the assistance given by the Committee on Bursary Appointments of Yale University and by the National Youth Administration, which provided, respectively, the services of William J. Garvey and Milton L. Barron, student aides.

² Miss Anna M. Hanson, Teaching Appointments Secretary of the Yale Graduate School, generously offered advice and the facilities of her comprehensive library of college catalogues.

in the two most recent and extensive directories of educational institutions in the United States.³

As is shown in Table 1, the representativeness of the sample proved to be remarkably regular in all except two categories, namely, Catholic and Protestant colleges. The former are under-represented, the latter over-represented.

TABLE 1. DISTRIBUTION OF THE SAMPLE

	Total Colleges	Percent	Sample	Percent
Northeast	216	23.3	149	24.5
Middle West	294	31.6	194	31.9
Far West	90	9.7	59	9.7
South	328	35.4	205	33.9
Protestant	292	31.4	267	43.9
Catholic	148	16.0	51	8.4
Non-sectarian	488	52.6	289	47.7
Men	99	10.7	94	13.8
Women	172	18.5	91	16.7
Co-educational	657	70.8	422	69.5

With the information available, it is possible to answer the following questions concerning the teaching of sociology in American colleges:

(1) How does the amount of sociology taught vary in different areas of the United States and in the different kinds of colleges?

(2) What is the relative popularity of the various types of sociology courses in (a) the country as a whole, (b) the different kinds of colleges, and (c) colleges of different sizes?

(3) What is the usual developmental pattern of courses as sociology departments expand their offerings?

Frequency of Sociology Courses. For the purposes of this survey the nine census regions of the country are combined in four larger areas: Northeast Middle West, Far West, and South.⁴ Analysis of the relative amount of sociology taught in colleges in these areas discloses that the average number of such courses per college is highest in the Far West (10.7), slightly lower in the Middle West (10.5), and lowest in the Northeast and South (7.9 each). These figures, however, do not present a true picture, for the sizes of colleges are not similar in the four areas. Obviously, one cannot expect a region with many small institutions to match the quantity of courses in a region with a greater proportion of large colleges. The same principle applies to non-geographic categories. Co-educational schools, for instance, are larger, on the average, than men's or women's colleges; and non-sectarian institutions have a higher average enrollment than denominational schools.

³ United States Office of Education, *Educational Directory, 1941, Part III, Colleges and Universities, Bulletin 41, Number 1*. Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1941. C. S. Marsh (editor), *American Universities and Colleges*. Washington, American Council on Education, 1940.

⁴ Our Northeast area includes census regions I and II; our Middle West, regions III and IV; our Far West, regions V and VI; and our South, regions VII, VIII, and IX.

It was necessary, therefore, to take size into consideration in all our analyses. When this is done, the results appear as in Table 2.

TABLE 2. AVERAGE NUMBER OF SOCIOLOGY COURSES PER COLLEGE

	General Average	Average According to Number of Students			
		0-499	500-999	1000-4999	5000 and over
Northeast	7.9	6.3	5.6	8.6	18.7
Middle West	10.5	7.2	9.5	14.7	22.6
Far West	10.7	5.6	10.0	13.5	21.0
South	7.9	5.5	8.3	10.3	20.1
Men	5.8	3.6	4.3	7.9	17.0
Women	8.2	6.9	9.9	11.6	8.0
Co-educational	9.9	6.5	8.9	12.5	21.6
Catholic	8.7	7.6	9.3	10.1	3.0
Protestant	7.4	6.3	8.0	13.5	12.0
Non-sectarian	10.5	6.1	8.7	11.5	21.3
Total	9.1	6.3	8.2	11.4	20.6

Western colleges as a whole easily outstrip those in the South and Northeast in average number of sociology courses, the Middle West being the over-all leader, and the Northeast the laggard. In only one instance does the average number of courses fail to increase with college size, that is, in the Northeast, where institutions with enrollments of 500-999 students actually average fewer courses in sociology than those with enrollments of below 500. This irregularity is due to the fact that several of the medium-sized "old conservative" Northeastern men's colleges have not yet seen fit to introduce sociology into their tradition-bound curricula.

The average number of sociology courses per college is highest in co-educational institutions (9.9), lowest in men's schools (5.8), and intermediate in those having only women students (8.2). Here again, however, the factor of relative size must be considered, for most of the largest colleges are co-educational. Women's and co-educational colleges are almost equally matched in every size category except the very largest, where the latter attain a higher average. Men's colleges are lowest in all except the largest category, where they outstrip women's schools.

One might infer from what has now been stated that sociology is given greater emphasis in more recently founded colleges than in older ones, for, in general, the Western schools and women's and co-educational institutions, where it appears to be most popular, were established much later than men's colleges and those in the Northeast. Undoubtedly, subservience to tradition and the resistance of deep-rooted older departments, with vested interests in the curriculum, have impeded the growth of sociology in the latter categories of colleges. The reader can easily supply his own instances, especially if he is familiar with those ivy-grown halls of learning

where sociology has never been given an opening or has been granted only a grudging minimum of acceptance as an upstart and somewhat disreputable "pseudoscience."

Proceeding now to another classification of colleges, we find that the average number of sociology courses per college is highest in non-sectarian schools (10.5), lowest in Protestant institutions (7.4), and intermediate in those under the auspices of the Catholic church (8.7). When relative size is taken into consideration, the true ranking is much less clear than in either the regional distribution or that of men's, women's, and co-educational colleges. The pattern, however, is quite definite, with Catholic schools averaging well above the other two kinds in the small and medium-sized categories, and dropping to lowest ranking among large and very large institutions. There is little to choose between Protestant and non-sectarian colleges, however; they alternate in second and third place in the two smaller categories, and in first and second in the two larger ones. The enormous non-sectarian universities, of course, throw their weight into the high average of 21.3 courses in the 5000-and-over class, just as they did in the maximum average of 21.6 in the same class among co-educational institutions.

Relative Popularity of Different Kinds of Sociology Courses. The classification of courses was a very difficult task, for the authors had to rely entirely on course titles and such thumbnail descriptions as are given in college catalogues. The names of courses alone, it was discovered, were misleading in a large proportion of cases; consequently in every instance the description was checked against the course title before classification. The descriptions of course content varied amazingly even among those with titles that would seem to indicate more or less standardized subject matter, e.g., Urban Sociology, Rural Sociology, Marriage and the Family, and Principles of Sociology. Repeated examination and classification finally resulted in the establishment of 31 different types of courses. Even then, however, 114 out of the total of 5544 courses had to be classed as "deviants." All categories totaling less than 10 courses the country over are included in this grouping. Most of them, however, are lone variants, such as Problems of Alcohol, Sociology for Nurses, The Art of Straight Thinking, and Social Adjustment to University Life.

The few previous classifications of sociology courses which have been made were examined.⁵ It was decided, however, that for our purpose here

⁵ Such classifications appear in J. Bernard, "The History and Prospects of Sociology in the United States," Chapter I in G. A. Lundberg, et al., *Trends in American Sociology* (New York, 1929); L. L. Bernard, "The Teaching of Sociology in the United States," *Amer. Jour. Sociol.*, 15: 164-213, 1909; F. L. Tolman, "The Study of Sociology in the Institutions of Learning in the United States," *Amer. Jour. Sociol.*, 7: 797-838, 1902; F. S. Chapin, "Report on Questionnaire of Committee on Teaching," *Amer. Jour. Sociol.*, 16: 774-793, 1911. F. N. House, in *The Development of Sociology*, New York, 1936, discusses ranking of courses and trends, but only in a general way.

a new and independent categorization would be preferable. The existing classifications do not agree among themselves, and the present authors felt that one of the services of this analysis might be to suggest a new grouping of courses, more meticulous than any of the preceding ones, and more directly derived from the titles and descriptions given in the college catalogues. Despite the lack of standardization of sociology offerings, in either course title or description, every effort was made to include in each of the 31 categories (32 including "deviants") only courses which might logically be subsumed under the designations chosen. Thus, to illustrate, one of our combined designations is Social Problems: this includes courses with this title, as well as those called by such terms as Applied Sociology, Practical Sociology, Poverty and Dependency, and Social Disorganization. In every instance, we repeat, the course description supplemented the course title to insure proper classification. There were many borderline cases; when the authors could not reach an agreement on these, opinions of other sociologists were sought. When a course appeared to be unclassifiable in any of the established categories, it was relegated to the grouping called "deviants." Obviously, this entire procedure entailed a fair amount of subjectivity, but this is unavoidable so long as courses in sociology continue to lack uniformity and standardization.

The results of our labors in classification and ranking appear in Table 3. The first column gives the ranking of each type of course in the country as a whole. Where a number is repeated, as in the case of Anthropology and Social Theory, which are both ranked 9 in the first column, this means that such courses are tied for the rank indicated. There are six such courses in the general ranking column. One variable we were unable to incorporate in our analysis was enrollment in courses. It is possible, for instance, that the total number of students taking courses in Marriage and the Family exceeds the number enrolled in Social Problems courses. Such information would have been exceedingly difficult to obtain; consequently we have arranged our rankings on the basis of the total number of courses offered in each category.

A total of 5544 courses were included in the survey. The largest category is General Sociology, which comprises 11.7 percent of all the courses (see Table 3). Virtually every college that offers sociology at all has at least one course in General or Introductory Sociology or Principles. Following close upon this category is Social Problems, and not far behind comes Marriage and the Family. These three stand out as by far the most popular, together constituting 29 percent of all the courses in the country.

There is a rather sharp drop in percentage after the first three courses. Social Work ranks 4th, Criminology 5th, Research Methods 6th, and Social Psychology 7th. All four rival each other closely, and together constitute 22 percent of all courses. The six following classifications: Rural Sociology, Anthropology, Social Theory, Race and Ethnic Groups, Urban Sociology,

TABLE 3. RANK-ORDER DISTRIBUTION OF SPECIFIC COURSES IN SOCIOLOGY ACCORDING TO LOCATION, KIND, AND SIZE OF COLLEGE

Gen- eral Rank ¹	Percent of all Courses	North- east	Mid- dle West	Far West	South	Men	Women	Co-edu- cational	Cath- olic	Prot- estant	Non-sec- tarian	Number of Students				Negro 5000 & over
												0-499	500-999	1000-4999	5000 & over	
1	11.7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
2	9.2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	7
3	8.1	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5
4	5.9	7	4	3	6	7	3	5	3	7	4	4	4	4	1	1
5	5.8	6	5	7	5	5	7	4	4	4	6	5	5	5	6	9
6	5.2	4	6	5	11	8	4	6	8	8	5	8	6	4	2	11
7	5.1	9	5	8	8	6	8	7	8	5	9	7	8	8	4	14
8	4.6	13	8	10	10	5	11	6	11	6	8	5	7	8	7	3
9	4.3	8	10	9	12	4	5	9	9	9	10	9	7	7	8	6
10	4.3	5	10	9	12	4	5	9	7	11	10	10	8	7	9	7
11	3.7	13	11	13	7	17	10	9	16	10	11	8	9	12	13	3
12	3.5	13	13	17	9	10	12	10	12	10	13	8	11	12	14	6
13	3.0	13	13	16	14	9	16	12	12	14	14	12	12	13	11	11
14	2.7	11	12	11	16	15	11	11	15	12	12	11	11	11	13	10
15	2.7	12	15	12	14	14	13	12	16	19	12	16	18	10	12	8
16	2.2	19	14	13	13	16	9	13	6	18	16	12	17	14	18	11
17	2.0	18	17	15	17	12	15	13	13	20	15	13	21	16	10	12
18	2.0	18	17	17	15	21	11	13	17	15	16	14	13	15	10	13
19	1.9	17	14	14	21	13	14	15	10	17	18	12	16	17	21	13
20	1.8	22	15	19	19	21	19	13	17	13	19	10	20	18	23	13
21	1.6	20	16	15	18	15	16	14	15	16	18	13	15	19	17	10
22	1.6	14	20	16	20	17	17	15	19	20	17	14	19	20	16	7
23	1.5	18	19	18	23	19	14	19	14	22	18	16	21	21	15	0
24	1.0	23	21	20	25	19	10	18	10	23	20	21	22	22	22	12
25	0.9	23	22	21	21	21	19	17	20	21	21	17	25	24	20	13
26	0.8	26	23	23	22	21	20	18	21	19	22	15	25	23	28	13
27	0.7	21	22	22	27	17	21	19	16	21	22	19	23	24	24	—
28	0.6	26	23	22	24	21	20	20	18	22	23	18	22	26	27	—
29	0.5	28	21	22	27	22	22	20	16	25	22	22	24	23	26	—
30	0.5	25	24	22	26	18	19	22	16	24	23	20	27	23	28	—
31	0.4	28	24	22	28	23	21	21	21	25	24	23	26	25	25	—
32	0.3	24	25	23	29	20	18	23	17	26	24	22	25	27	24	—

¹ For simplicity, the conventional statistical usage of ranks is not followed here. The 26 ranks represent 32 items.

and Public Welfare comprise 23.4 percent of all courses; when they are added to the first seven, together all thirteen include almost exactly three-fourths of all sociology taught in the undergraduate institutions of the United States. All other 19 classifications are spread over only one-fourth of the total number of courses. The 13 "main-line" courses, it is interesting to note, include at least four which many sociologists would regard as not strictly sociological in character, or at least as somewhat tangential to the field, namely, Social Work, Social Psychology, Anthropology, and Public Welfare. Some might even contend that Criminology, like these, is a distinct and well-developed discipline. Yet all of these rank among the most popular courses in sociology departments. It may be that here we are witnessing signs of the automatic evolution of a situation strongly desired and advocated by many sociologists and workers in kindred fields, namely, the eventual synthesis of all, or most, social sciences, with a mutual exchange of ideas and techniques and general agreement on fundamental principles. It would seem that strict separation is hardly desirable anyway. Certainly the line between "primitive" society, the primary sphere of anthropology, and modern life is very vague, and a true comprehension of man and his culture requires a knowledge of the whole range of human activity. Likewise, it is virtually impossible to study problems of social maladjustment without proceeding to the means employed to cope with them in public welfare programs and social work. Aside from these five courses, which may be regarded as somewhat peripheral, the other eight in the first thirteen would seem to sum up what persons responsible for teaching sociology consider to be its main content. If this is true, then, in addition to general principles and concepts, its subject matter consists principally of the pathological aspects of contemporary human society (poverty, dependency, and the like), marriage and the family, its own methods and procedures, the rural population, racial and ethnic groups, and the urban population.

The lower nineteen types of courses, together comprising only about one-fourth of the total, are more or less on the fringe, as it were, of the main interests of sociology teachers. The weak showing of some of these was unexpected. Economic Sociology, Religion, and Political Sociology together muster only 2.9 percent of all the courses; yet they deal with three of man's most important culturally organized activities: how he supports himself, how he responds to chance and the unknown, and how he governs himself. The last-place position of Political Sociology is striking, especially since a whole section of the American Sociological Society is devoted to this subject. Thus, of the four main social institutions—the economic, the religious, the political, and the domestic—sociology concentrates heavily upon only one, marriage and the family. It seems quite certain that the reason for this is that only in this institutional sphere did sociology, when it entered the curricula of American colleges some 50 years ago, find the ground not

yet pre-empted by some earlier established department. The faculties of economics, theology or philosophy, and political science or government had taken and have kept to themselves a major portion of the other three principal institutional fields, and have fought all encroachments by the new, more comprehensive discipline.

Indeed, it would appear that contemporary sociology bears still other marks of its late and irregular development. It was born of a peculiar union between humanitarianism and the philosophy of history.⁶ It justified its claim to scientific status by adopting (and, necessarily, adapting) the methods of the natural sciences and applying them to the social and cultural sphere, an effort in which it was aided by the pioneering work of anthropology in the relatively uncontroversial area of primitive society. If we look at what sociology is today, as evidenced by the subject matter it teaches, we can detect clear traces of its ancestry, although some of the germinal elements have since proven to be recessives. The historical lineage has dwindled to the point where Social History comprises only 1.5 percent of all sociology courses, ranking a poor 20th on the list. Here the probable explanation is that departments of history, with their increasing emphasis on social and cultural history rather than on the mere narrative type, have cut off this possible line of sociological development. The humanitarian element, on the contrary, is strongly flourishing, to the extent, indeed, that many laymen and scholars in other fields conceive of sociology as almost entirely a study of the dependent and defective classes.⁷ They are right to a certain extent, since if we add together all the courses which deal principally with social pathology and therapy (Social Problems, Social Work, Criminology, Public Welfare, and Child Welfare), they total over a quarter of all sociology taught in the United States, more, for instance, than all of our lower nineteen categories put together. Anthropology occupies a rather high rank, ninth; but this may well be owing to the fact that in many schools there is no separate faculty of anthropology and all courses in it are given by the sociology department. The fourth main element in sociology's ancestry, the catalyzing infusion of the methods of natural science, appears, we assume, in the sixth largest category of courses, Research Methods. It is interesting to note that departments of chemistry, physics, biology, and the other natural sciences seldom deem it necessary to devote separate courses to scientific method. Apparently sociology must do this, for in applying, or attempting to apply, methods derived from the natural sciences to social phenomena, special problems arise. As noted above, these

⁶ The "four academic precursors" of sociology in the United States, according to Jessie Bernard, were courses in "social science," social problems (with a religious coloring), the history of civilization, and the philosophy of history. *Op. cit.*, 6.

⁷ Recently one of the authors, after speaking to a group of graduate students in the natural sciences on the subject "What Is Sociology?" was told by a member of the audience: "Before hearing you, I had always thought sociologists were interested only in insane asylums and prisons."

methods cannot be adopted; they must be adapted; and this, seemingly, is why sociology departments devote so much time to training students in social research procedure.

Looking over the whole range and ranking of sociology courses in the first column of Table 3, one is tempted to pass a few remarks concerning the future development of the science. At present, it would seem that an undue proportion of the curriculum is devoted to social pathology and therapy, while analysis of the normative structure and processes of society and culture is relatively under-emphasized. As noted above, sociologists now sadly neglect three of the four main institutions of society, although they turn full force on the fourth, marriage and the family. But even though economists, theologians, and political scientists may have pre-empted the other three institutional spheres, there is yet room in these broad, fundamental areas of inquiry for the sociologists as well; indeed, although this may be a biased opinion, the fresh viewpoint sociologists could bring to these studies might enlighten the narrower specialists who burrow deeper and deeper into their discrete subjects and seldom look over the surrounding barriers to the totality of human activity. How often, for instance, do economists study actual economic behavior, or even consider the basic biological and cultural imperatives behind economic behavior? Where are the human case studies of economic activity? The same kind of questions can be asked concerning theology and political science. The practitioners of these disciplines devote most of their time to the description of structures—churches, states, and the like—but the functioning of the institutions, their integration into the totality of society and culture, and the human elements involved in their functioning, are largely overlooked.

Other analytical, non-pathological, normative fields that might be developed more than they are at present include Social Processes, Community Organization, Social Organization, and Social Geography. The anthropologists have done excellent service in the primitive aspects of these studies; it would seem that the time is ripe for more "modern ethnography" or "folk sociology." The recent upsurge of interest in community and regional studies may well foreshadow a trend in this direction.

Certainly the wide range of subjects listed here indicates that sociologists are still feeling their way to an integrated science. They are still experimenting with possible lines of development, a healthy sign in a young discipline. The fact that "deviants" rank as high as 17th in the list of courses is in itself a notable indication of, at best, open-mindedness, and, at worst, uncertainty as to what sociology may properly include. Undoubtedly another factor is operative in the erratic ramifications of sociology, a factor which Jessie Bernard noted in examining the college catalogues of some forty years ago: "One can scarcely read the early catalogues of the various universities and colleges without getting the impression that the administrators felt sociology to be a sort of catch-all course which should consider

all the problems that could not find room in political science, economics, jurisprudence, history, or other disciplines."⁸ This would seem to be still true, and the sociologists themselves are apparently anything but reluctant to go even further and think up new kinds of courses on their own initiative.

The classification we have termed "deviants" contains a heterogeneous mass of courses numbering 114, or 2 percent of the total. A random selection of deviants includes: Conference Course in Personal Planning ("designed to assist students in making intelligent plans for life"), Problems of Youth ("the problems facing young people today . . . and possible solutions in the light of Christian principles of living and good social conduct"), Personal Problems, Personnel Problems, Advanced Personnel Practice, Organization and Leadership for Adolescent Girls, Training Course for Camp Counselors, Principles of Boy Scouting, The Art of Straight Thinking, The Sociology of Knowledge, A Study of Significant Lives, Social Adjustments to University Life, Radio as a Social Institution, Sociology for Nurses, Concrete Sociology, and Problems of Alcohol.

Aside from the actual deviants, many courses with standard titles have rather remarkable descriptions. Indeed, the wide variation in the titles of sociology courses is far surpassed in the statements of their subject matter. Beyond question, the greatest diversity is encountered in descriptions of courses in Marriage and the Family, a large proportion of which would seem to concentrate more upon clinical advice to students than upon strictly sociological analysis of the family institution. Here, for instance, is one course description: "Previous classes have proven that this intimate and important subject can be discussed with delicacy and dignity. Men and women should not enter this sacred relationship without due thought and careful preparation. Science is teaching how to avoid some of the tragic mistakes of earlier years. A scientific and cultured mind can avoid both pruriency and prudery and profitably prepare for one of life's greatest adventures." Another course also terms marriage "a great adventure," and offers to advise the student how to prepare for it. The statement of a course called Building the American Home asks: "Is there something wrong with the home of today?" and goes on to promise that "this course will attempt to . . . create a sacred responsibility for its future." Only one college in our sample separates the sexes in its marriage course; this school, moreover, employs a physician to teach it. Another institution apparently sees no need for this kind of caution, for its course in marriage is "not a sensational course [but a] presentation of the proper relationships in life." A large college in the Middle West has a course in the family which examines "democracy and totalitarianism as reflected in marriage and the family." Religious schools almost invariably give an ethical twist to marriage courses. One "makes an effort" to solve marriage problems "in a Christian way";

⁸ J. Bernard, *op. cit.*, 14.

another "emphasizes the spiritualization of marriage." Catholic colleges treat marriage as a sacrament, and therefore encounter special problems. In their marriage courses particular attention is given to such matters as: "dangers of the evil of divorce," "family life according to Catholic teaching," and "secularism as corroding the American family." Most of them use the papal encyclicals as basic guides.

A miscellaneous selection of other rather striking course write-ups includes the following: a course in General Sociology instills "social idealism and service"; in a course in Principles of Sociology "the subject will be taught with emphasis on moral and ethical principles of Christian Sociology and in accordance with the principles of Jesus"; a Social Pathology statement declares that "occasionally the course is converted into a study of the American Indian as an example of a pathological race"; another with the same title avers that "the causes and remedies for the social evils are profoundly studied"; one of the Selected Problems of Sociology in a certain college is "the idle rich"; a course entitled Christianity and Society pays "special attention to the application of Christian principles to the social problems of the Southeastern States," one Criminology item is described as "a survey of the present startling situation"; a course in Urban Sociology states that "the modern city is a social storm center; the course will . . . determine the causes which make it a magnet and a peril"; The Philosophy of Leisure makes "an attempt to discover the possibilities of a continuation of civilization under conditions of prosperity and leisure"; a course in Social Conflict examines, among other things, "male vs. female conflict"; a Catholic Anthropology course expounds "evolution and its difficulties"; another Catholic college course, called Social Programs, indicates "the paramount importance of a reform of hearts and minds as preparation for the reconstruction of the social and economic order" and investigates "the elements that enter into the determination of a 'just price' in the light of the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas"; Contemporary Social, Economic and Political Trends evaluates "the potentialities of 'creeping collectivism' in the United States"; one course in Social Psychology instructs the student "how to become a socius." The sociology sections of American college catalogues make really exciting reading.

Trends in Sociology Courses. Three previous studies have been made of the teaching of sociology in colleges.⁹ Comparison with the present survey is difficult, as all three differ in their classifications, and, to the present authors at least, many of their categories are by no means clear. Moreover, whereas we have worked with total number of courses, the previous studies ranked their courses by the number of colleges with offerings in each of the categories. We have interpreted these studies to the best of our ability. Tolman's

⁹ The articles of Tolman, Bernard, and Chapin previously mentioned. They are summarized in detail by J. Bernard (*op. cit.*), and in general terms by House (*op. cit.*).

survey, made in 1902, L. L. Bernard's analysis, made in 1907-8, and Chapin's study of 1910, all re-interpreted by the present authors, show rank orders of courses which are compared with our 1939-41 findings in Table 4.

The 1902 column shows Social Theory in third place, while Research Methods is far down, next to last in the list. Tolman remarks that sociologists should "develop sociology as a method of research."¹⁰ His advice proved to be a prediction, for by 1907-8 Research Methods had risen to 5th place, and in 1939-41 it still retains the high rank of 6th. The 1910 combination apparently distributed research courses among the other categories. Social Theory was 3rd in ranking in 1902, 4th in 1907-8, 5th in 1910, but has now slipped to 10th. Chapin's conclusion of 1910 is certainly not applicable today: "the classification . . . shows a majority laying emphasis upon theoretical subject matter including the historical and the psycho-

TABLE 4. TRENDS IN THE RANKING OF SOCIOLOGY COURSES

1902	1907-8	1910	1939-41
1 General Sociology	General Sociology	Social Psychology	General Sociology 1
2 Social Problems	Social Problems	Social Problems	Social Problems 2
3 Social Theory	Social Psychology	General Sociology	Marriage & Family 3
4 Economic Sociology	Social Theory	Anthropology	Social Work 4
5 Political Sociology	Research Methods	Social Theory	Criminology 5
6 Criminology	Urban Sociology	Social Organization	Research Methods 6
7 Anthropology	Rural Sociology	Social Processes	Social Psychology 7
8 Social Ethics	Religion	Economic Sociology	Rural Sociology 8
9 Religion	Anthropology	Criminology	Anthropology 9
10 Social Psychology	Marriage & Family	Race & Ethnic Groups	Social Theory 10
11 Population Problems	Social Movements	Population Problems	Race & Ethnic Groups 11
12 Social History	Population Problems	Educational Sociology	Urban Sociology 12
13 Urban Sociology		Social Geography	Public Welfare 13
14 Social Geography		Social Movements	Population Problems 14
15 Race & Ethnic Groups			Social Processes 15
16 Educational Sociology			Child Welfare 16
17 Marriage & Family			"Deviants" 17
18 Public Welfare			Community Organization 18
19 Leisure & Recreation			Economic Sociology 19
20 Research Methods			Educational Sociology 20
21 Rural Sociology			Social Movements 21
22			Social Organization 22
23			Statistics 23
24			Social History 24
25			Social Geography 25
26			Social Science Orientation 26
27			Religion 27
28			Urban-Rural Sociology 28
29			Leisure & Recreation 29
30			Social Ethics 30
31			Leadership 31
32			Political Sociology 32

logical, as opposed to the practical subject matter specified by Charity, Poor Relief, Philanthropy, etc."¹¹ Economic and Political Sociology stood high, 4th and 5th, in 1902, but in 1910 the former had dropped to 8th, and

¹⁰ Tolman, *op. cit.*, 86.

¹¹ Chapin, *op. cit.*, 784.

in 1939-41 to 19th. Political Sociology, meanwhile, has become so rare as to be almost a "deviant" in our classification.¹² Social Problems and Criminology have pursued even careers of high popularity, the former retaining 2nd place all through the years, the latter dropping slightly from 6th to 9th between 1902 and 1910, but rising to 5th by 1939-41. Anthropology, except for a sharp rise to 4th place in 1910, has been 7th or 9th at each interval; its decline after 1910 is probably attributable to the increasing number of separate anthropology departments. Ethics and Religion, high (8th and 9th) in 1902, have now dropped far down the list, to 30th and 27th, respectively. Psychology, 10th in 1902, climbed sharply to 3rd in 1907-8, and 1st in 1910; since then it has slipped to 6th. Here again, as in the case of Anthropology, we may be witnessing an effect of departmental separation. The decline in Social History from 12th in 1902 to 24th in 1939-41 may be in part owing to another kind of situation, in which an older department, history, has absorbed the viewpoint, and with it the courses, once offered by sociology. No very striking variations in trend appear in Population Problems, Social Geography, Race and Ethnic Groups, or Educational Sociology. Urban and Rural Sociology, however, have now reversed their earlier positions. Rural Sociology, last in 1902, is now 8th, while Urban, well above Rural forty years ago, is now in 12th place. Marriage and the Family has had perhaps the most sensational career of all the courses. Starting in 17th place in 1902, it rose to 10th in 1907-8, and has now attained 3rd ranking. Bain, writing about sociological research in 1924, remarked that "interest in Family is declining."¹³ This is certainly not true today, judging by the number of courses offered in the subject.

Table 3 presents the ranking of the various classifications of courses in specified regions, and in different kinds and sizes of colleges. The Northeast and the South show most deviation from the general ranking in all categories; the Middle and Far West follow the national ranking very closely.

In men's colleges, one finds a relative under-representation of courses in Race and Ethnic groups and Community Organization, and an unusual emphasis on Anthropology and Social Theory. In women's schools, particular interest is shown in Social Work, Public Welfare, Child Welfare, and Community Organization. Just as the Western colleges adhere more closely to the general ranking than do those in the Northeast and South, so also do co-educational schools approximate the national distribution more nearly than men's and women's institutions. This, of course, is partly attributable to the fact that the largest proportion of all colleges are co-educational.

¹² J. Bernard remarks of these two subjects as of 1907: "Presumably Sociology was beginning to leave these disciplines to economists and to political scientists." *Op. cit.*, 30.

¹³ R. Bain, "Trends in American Sociology," *Social Forces*, V, 422, 1927.

Catholic schools lay less emphasis on Marriage and the Family than do Protestant and non-sectarian institutions. Probably the main reason for this is that Catholics are reluctant to treat analytically one of the sacraments of the church. Social Work, on the other hand, is very popular in both Catholic and co-educational colleges, but under-represented in Protestant schools. Other marked deviations from the national ranking in Catholic colleges are as follows: the study of Race and Ethnic Groups is under-emphasized, while unusual stress is given to Child Welfare, Economic Sociology, Political Sociology, Religion, and Ethics. The vital and increasing concern of the Catholic church with economic and political questions is reflected in the special emphasis given to courses in these subjects. Compared with Catholic schools, Protestant and non-sectarian institutions follow the general ranking quite closely, the latter showing least deviation all along the line.

Ranking according to size of college discloses much less deviation from the national ranking than the other three groupings (by region, sex, and denomination). Nevertheless, certain irregularities do appear, and most of the more marked ones occur in small and very large institutions. Thus, the colleges with enrollments of less than 500 teach relatively little Social Work, but concentrate a proportionally large share of their sociology offerings in Educational Sociology, combined Urban and Rural Sociology courses, and orientation courses in social science. The latter two are clearly economy measures adopted to cope with the handicap of small faculties. Very large colleges, with more than 5000 students, offer such a high proportion of Social Work courses that this category ties with General Sociology for first place.

The ranking of courses in Negro schools is considerably different from the general ranking for all colleges. Moreover, several kinds of courses represented in non-Negro schools are not taught in the colored colleges examined. The leading course is Social Work, apparently considered so desirable in Negro colleges that it outranks even General Sociology, which stands second. This is probably a reflection of the fact that, aside from teaching in Negro schools, the sociologically trained Negro finds the best opportunities for employment in social work among his own people. The third ranking course is Rural Sociology, obviously emphasized because most Negroes live on the land. That Race and Ethnic Groups should stand equally high is to be expected also: Negroes are interested in their own problems. These constitute "the big four" in the teaching of Negro sociology, together comprising 36.8 percent of all courses. As for the other courses on the list, Negro colleges show a markedly greater interest than is evidenced by the generality of institutions in Social Psychology, Urban Sociology, Social Organization, Statistics, Social Movements, and Social History. Considerably less emphasis, relatively, is given to Marriage and the Family, Social Problems, Criminology, and Research Methods.

The Usual Developmental Pattern of Courses in Sociology Departments. The number of courses offered by the sociology departments in our sample ranged from one to 44 per college. Analysis of the specific kinds of courses in departments of various size reveals the usual pattern of development as departments expand their offerings. Certain courses are usually preferred when only two are offered, while certain others appear only as departments expand, and some are seldom or never given except in very large departments. Since there are only 32 course categories, it is obvious that some of the larger departments offer more than one course in certain classifications.

This analysis re-emphasized a fact already noted, namely, that General Sociology, Social Problems, and Marriage and the Family constitute the "big three" of sociology teaching in America today. If there can be but one course, it will be of a general nature; if there are two, next choice will be given to the study of social pathology. In three-course departments, General Sociology still occupies 1st rank, but Marriage and the Family enters to tie with Social Problems for 2nd place. Approximately the same pattern prevails in four-course departments, with Criminology as the new addition. These courses occupy the first four ranks in departments having five to nine courses; the 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th additions being, respectively, Rural Sociology, Social Psychology, Social Work, Anthropology, and Race and Ethnic Groups. So generally consistent is this gradual emergence of courses as departments expand that we feel justified in affirming that it portrays the usual developmental pattern. It should be mentioned that a given course may not occupy the same rank in departments of all sizes; it may, after having become a part of the configuration of courses at a given level, rise or fall in relative importance. To illustrate: General Sociology is highest in rank in departments ranging from one to 20 courses, above which it drops to 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th in the larger departments; nevertheless, although occupying 5th place in colleges with more than 40 sociology courses, it obviously still figures in the structural pattern of such departments. In the lower classifications especially, it is true, considerable variation occurs in different areas and in different kinds of colleges, and a fair idea of this variation can be obtained by glancing at Table 3, which shows the ranking of courses in the several kinds of schools and in the four areas of the country.

Here, then, is *an* answer to our original question: "What Is Sociology?" It is not a complete answer, for different results would undoubtedly emerge from an analysis of, say, current research or current publications. But this article tells what sociologists teach to the hundreds of thousands of students who each year pass through our undergraduate colleges. It is what sociologists offer to the citizenry of the land as their main justification for existence as specialized scientists.

GENERAL INTRODUCTORY COURSES IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES*

LELAND C. DEVINNEY AND EARL S. JOHNSON

University of Wisconsin

University of Chicago

Points of Interest. Types of general social science courses according to catalogues and as seen by more intimate observation. Should the sociologist have an equal share, or definite leadership in the development of such courses? Is any type especially promising? [Ed.]

THE PURPOSE of this brief paper is to report the findings of an inquiry into the prevalence and characteristics of general courses in the social sciences in the colleges and universities of the United States. By general course we refer to any course which is described in the catalogue as an inter-departmental, divisional, or supra-departmental introduction to, or survey of, the fields of the social sciences, or a study of society. Its opposite is the traditional course concerned with a single social discipline.¹

The institutions whose curricula we have examined are the 672 colleges and universities listed in the *Educational Directory* for 1941. For 66 of these, no catalogue was available to us. An examination of the catalogues of 504 revealed no general courses in the social sciences but the remaining 102 were found to be offering such a course.²

While we are fully aware of the inadequacy of catalogue descriptions of courses as a basis for knowing their content and organization we have, nevertheless, been forced to use them for what they may be worth. Using catalogue titles and descriptions as the basis for classifying the 108 courses found in 102 institutions we get the following types.

(1) Courses described as introduction to, orientation to, backgrounds of, and foundations of the *social sciences* or social studies, and such other related phrases as survey of, or general course in, the social sciences. Sixty-nine courses, or more than 60 per cent of the total number, fell into this name class.

(2) Courses labeled as introduction to, history of, and development of civilization or identified as a course in *contemporary civilization* totalled 25.

(3) While a number of courses in the first group contained sub-titles which indicated a concern with *social problems*, 8 courses bore titles such as problems of contemporary civilization, introduction to state and regional problems, and simply, social problems.

(4) The remaining six courses were labeled as follows: Man and Society, Introduction to Human Relations, Development of Modern Society, Institutions of Modern Democracy, and Community Organization.

* Presented to the American Sociological Society, Dec. 28, 1941, at New York City.

¹ No general courses above the sophomore level were considered. In some institutions "integrated courses" are offered for juniors and seniors.

² In a few cases a single institution offers two general courses.

INTRODUCTORY COURSES IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES 677

Perhaps more significant than titles is the administering department.

From the data of Table 1 it is seen that divisional, or at least non-departmental, administration holds in 70 courses—just short of 65 percent of the total number. With this is associated the fact that many staff members are identified with "social science" rather than with one of the single traditional disciplines. Some are identified with two such disciplines. Administration of general courses by single departments is led by history with 14 courses; sociology is second with 11. All those administered by departments of sociology are in the first type as classified above; these are the causes in whose title the term social science or social studies appears in every case. It is quite as noteworthy that 6 courses, or 25 percent of those whose titles contain the term "civilization" are administered by departments of history. This fact suggests that some of the courses in this group may be little more than the traditional course in the history of civilization.

TABLE 1. ADMINISTRATION OF 108 GENERAL COURSES IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

	<i>Type</i>				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Total
Social Science Division or non-departmental	43	16	5	6	70
History	8	6	0	0	14
Sociology	11	0	0	0	11
Economics	4	0	1	0	5
Economics and Sociology	1	0	1	0	2
History and Social Science	0	1	0	0	1
History and Sociology	0	1	0	0	1
Political Science	1	0	0	0	1
Bible	0	0	1	0	1
Human Living	1	0	0	0	1
Citizenship	1	0	0	0	1

In only 51 courses out of the total of 108 do the catalogues indicate specifically for whom the course is intended. In 22 cases the course is specified as required of all freshmen and in 15 cases it is required for further work for all or for certain groups of students. While it would be illuminating to know what disciplines the staff members in the various types of courses represent, the catalogues give but meager data.

Some remarks may be made concerning the size of the institution in which the general course in the social sciences is most likely to be found. Forty, or 38 percent, of the total number were found in college and universities with large enrolments—hence the largest institutions. Since institutions of their size constitute far less than 38 percent of the total number of the colleges and universities in the United States it is clear that the relation between the size of the institution and the presence of a general course in the social sciences is not accidental. Further evidence of the validity of this observation may be had by comparing the percent of colleges and universities offering such a course with the percent of junior colleges (considered as

separate institutions) in which such a course is found.³ General social science courses were found in only 33 of a total of 438 junior colleges and in 102 out of a total of 672 colleges and universities. Thus, while only 7½ percent of the junior colleges offer such a course, 15 percent of the colleges and universities offer one.

One might be permitted to speculate upon some of the factors responsible for the fact that the general course in the social sciences is found more frequently in large than in small collegiate institutions and in four year institutions more frequently than in those with two year programs. In the first place, the larger institutions have been first to make the distinction between what is often termed the "lower" and "upper" division—or the "junior" and "senior" college. This distinction has, in turn, tended to sharpen the differentiation between general and special education. The general course in the social sciences may thus be seen as a natural emergence within a curriculum which is itself general rather than special. Furthermore, in the larger institutions there are more persons available for such a co-operative enterprise than would usually hold in institutions with smaller student bodies and faculties. Finally, it is not fantastic to suggest that the general course is not unrelated to the effort to reduce the costs of instruction when college enrolments were expanding and financial resources shrinking.

It remains to discuss briefly the major types of general courses in the social sciences on the basis of their content. We were not able, in the time at our disposal, to secure detailed information on the content of even a large fraction of the courses here reported. But from a fairly detailed knowledge of a considerable number of such courses, supplemented by a careful examination of the catalogue descriptions of the others, it seems possible to identify among the courses now being offered what might be called four "ideal types" of general introductory social science courses.⁴

The *first* of these is, in reality, a history course masquerading as an introduction to the social sciences. It is an historical survey of civilization or of culture or of some segment or selection from more conventional history courses. The prevalence of such courses seems to be a consequence of the traditional domination of the field by historians and the consequent tendency to turn responsibility for general introductory courses over to departments of history.

The *second* major type of general course is the survey of social problems, oriented toward the great interest in contemporary difficulties or evils in society, and frequently characterized by a strong reformist emphasis. More often than not the selection of problems appears to be determined by

³ The general course in the social sciences in the junior college remains for study. Little more than the number of courses was discovered in this brief inquiry.

⁴ Although the typology given here bears some resemblance to the groups of courses given above, no one-to-one correlation between the two classifications was intended.

current popular interest and to shift in response to changes in this interest. This type of course is handled by any one of several departments or by representatives from varying combinations of them and it shows very considerable variation on the basis of which department dominates it or provides its teaching personnel.

Third of these types is an inter-departmental course presenting a succession of samplings or thumb-nail sketches of the various disciplines in the social sciences, or of some selection of them. Such a course is usually a survey of existing departmental offerings in the social science division. Not infrequently this course is handled by a succession of departmental specialists each of whom comes for a brief period to present his own specialty.

Fourth, and last, is the type of general course which undertakes a more or less systematic description of contemporary society, drawing freely on the methods and materials of the various special disciplines but keeping its focus on a reasonably coherent picture of the basic features of present-day social processes and institutions. Such a course requires the cooperative efforts of specialists in various departments who are able and willing to devote considerable amounts of time and energy to the integration of the approaches, methods, and materials of their several fields.

These four types of general courses have been termed "ideal types" because they are abstractions from most of the actual courses and in some degree idealizations of the others. The majority of the existing courses are a mixture of two or more of these types. They are, however, frequently dominated by one of them. Moreover, several existing courses more or less closely approximate each of the types described.

It is not the main function of this paper to undertake an appraisal of the courses which it has reported. But, as a basis for discussion, a word may be said in conclusion about the authors' judgment concerning the limitations and possibilities in each of these basic types.

An historical survey of civilization or of human culture, if well organized and well taught, seems to us a valuable and highly desirable aspect of any student's general education. It does not, however, provide an introduction to the field of the social sciences, nor, in our judgment, provide an adequate basis for even a layman's understanding of contemporary society.

A survey of contemporary social problems seems to us a relevant and significant part of every student's education. We are, however, doubtful whether such a course should be offered as an introduction to the field; it should, we feel, follow after the basic training in the social sciences has provided a ground for competent analysis of social problems. We feel, also, that there is an ever-present risk—and far too great a tendency—for the discussion of problems in such a course to be carried on only at the level of "informed common sense" *at the best*, and the imposition of personal prejudice *at the worst*. Those who regard competence in the social sciences

only as the possession of "right bias" may see no limitation in this tendency. We think, however, that rigorous analytical procedures developed in various special disciplines are indispensable to any competent discussion of contemporary problems. It is, of course, possible that a general introductory course focussed on the discussion of current problems might develop competence in relevant analytical techniques where they are needed. We are inclined to believe that this procedure wastes much valuable time and leaves the student in an unnecessarily chaotic state of mind in an area in which, at the very best, there must be too much confusion. And we are sure that too frequently the development of indispensable technical skills is not attempted in this type of course.

A survey of the special social science disciplines seems to us more useful for students who are specializing in one of them than for the general student who is in greater need of elementary training in understanding himself and his social world. We are convinced that this needed training can be given far more effectively and adequately in an integrated course about that social world than through *seriatim* discussion of the various departmental abstractions from it.

By now it must be clear that we are partial to the more systematic and integrated descriptions of social processes and contemporary institutions (with one of the major attempts at which we have both been associated). But a number of risks are encountered here also. Such a course may be unduly academic unless given relevance and significance to the student by concreteness, appropriate illustration, use of required techniques in the analysis of selected contemporary problems, and some degree of coherence in the systematic and descriptive aspects of the course. This latter requirement depends in large degree on the character of the integrating principle used. Here, it seems to us, is where the sociologist has a major contribution to make. The anthropological-sociological approach to culture offers, we think, the most fruitful basis for an integrated description of contemporary society. But sociologists are not competent to provide this description by themselves. An adequate general introductory course in the social sciences is far more than a glorified course in sociology just as it is more than a glorified course in history. If sociologists are to fulfill what we believe to be their obligation in this promising field, some of them will need to acquire considerable degrees of competence in economics, political science, and other social disciplines and also find means of making sociology intelligible and sensible to specialists in these fields. Social scientists possessed of this mutual understanding and some degree of inter-departmental competence may have the imagination and ingenuity to construct the satisfactorily integrated, competent, and significant general course in the social sciences for which both the need and the demand appear to be growing.

T
tiona
so m
is st
Ever
fusio
perin
whic
of th
curri
by so
cation
ists a
conv
We
cours
differ
discus
mores
fields
from
other
studen
any so
effort
integra
concep
ing ide

* Pr
† Th

THE SURVEY COURSE IN SOCIAL SCIENCE: AN APPRAISAL*

JULIAN L. WOODWARD
Cornell University†

Points of interest. A courageous facing of the question: "Social science for what?" Social science seen in relation to the total aims of college education. What about indoctrination? Social sciences may "train the mind" as well as the classics and mathematics and in addition provide useful knowledge. What are the obstacles? [Ed.]

THAT THE survey course in social science is making its way in colleges and universities has been demonstrated in the preceding paper. There is, however, still a recalcitrant opposition which, partly on educational grounds and partly because the shift to the survey course involves so much inconvenient readjustment and upsets so many vested interests, is still insistent on maintaining the departmentalized curriculum intact. Even among the supporters of the survey course idea there is still much confusion about the differing aims of the various types of survey now being experimented with, and the issues as between the survey and the courses which it replaces are not clear cut. It is hoped in this paper to clarify some of these issues and define the role of the social science survey course in the curriculum a little more exactly. This may help to get consideration of it, by sociologists at least, on its real merits. For the survey is a valuable educational instrument and not just a device created by soft-headed educationists and administrators to keep overworked professors still busier, and to convince the public that X University is more progressive than most.

We must begin by agreeing on a definition of what a social science survey course is, because in its present unstandardized state of development many different types of courses pass under that name. For the purposes of our discussion it will be defined as a course offered to college freshmen or sophomores in which the subject matter is drawn from all three of the academic fields of political science, economics, and sociology, and *may* also be taken from history, anthropology, human geography, social psychology, or any other social science. It is further assumed in the definition that (1) the students enrolled will not have had any previous work at college level in any social science covered in the survey course content and (2) that some effort has been made to interweave or, to use the fashionable term, to *integrate*, the materials from separate disciplines in relation to some general conceptual scheme. The previous paper has suggested some of the integrating ideas and principles that have been employed in survey courses to date.

* Presented to the American Sociological Society, Dec. 28, 1941, at New York City.

† The author is serving in the Office of Facts and Figures, Washington.

It will immediately be recognized that an argument for such an instructional unit as the survey course must be based on some educational philosophy. College professors as a group have been less concerned to make their educational aims explicit than have their teaching colleagues in primary and secondary schools but it is possible to list the objectives of instruction that are most frequently emphasized. There is, first, the general aim sought in all vocational education, that of training for the successful practice of the art in question. Frequently set over against the professional emphasis are the various aims that underly what is called "general education." Among the end results commonly sought through general education for all students, no matter what their vocational plans may be, are (1) the development of the ability to think clearly and critically with respect to any subject matter, a sort of general intellectual power factor, (2) the acquisition of certain important knowledge about the world and its inhabitants, and (3) the development of a set of attitudes and values, social, moral, and aesthetic, which will comprise the student's life philosophy and his tastes and preferences, and which will define his role in relation to the issues in a changing society. These are compound objectives and each one subsumes, as we shall see, a number of conflicting emphases. Furthermore, the educational philosophy of any given professor will be his own personal mixture of aims from the four categories, with a system of weights that will be affected by the nature of his own discipline as well as his own predilections. We might outline such a personal philosophy in detail, and then evaluate the survey course with reference to it, but the results would be of limited application and would be rejected in part or in whole by those with even slightly different educational views. The more difficult but perhaps more useful plan has been chosen of taking up one by one the four major educational aims of acquiring vocational competence, critical intellectual ability, significant knowledge, and desirable values and attitudes, considering the survey course's special advantages and disadvantages in attempting to realize each of them, and comparing its adaptability in these respects with that of its most feasible alternative, the elementary course in the special science.

1. The Vocational Aim. The role of the social science survey course in relation to the aims of professional education can be dealt with briefly. In the professional school with a course of study built directly on a high school certificate, such as a college of agriculture, home economics, or engineering, the vocational choice of the student has been made, and instruction must contribute first of all to his professional training. Elementary work in the social sciences is a part of general education in such institutions, for which the time is strictly limited, and the election of a specialized introductory course in one field, say economics, is likely to preclude any possibility of including courses in other social science disciplines. The survey course obviates this difficulty and while the result may be a less thorough knowledge of economics, any lack in this respect is more than made up by the at least

elementary familiarity with sociology and government that has been gained. The survey, either one specially constructed for the professional school group or the one given in the arts college on the same campus, will open more doors to the often narrowly trained professional practitioner and will broaden his horizons. It does not give him mastery of any one social science, but neither does the single specialized elementary course he would take in its place.

Where specifically professional training is postponed beyond the freshman or sophomore year, as is the case in medical and legal education, and in some engineering instruction and teacher training, the survey course comes at a time when a final vocational commitment has not been made. Probably a large proportion of students "preparing" at this level to be lawyers or teachers are still much in doubt as to the vocational goal they should be aiming at and are still willing to change their plans in the light of new experience as it accumulates. At this stage it is extremely important that this new experience be provided them, that they come in contact with as many different types of subject matter as possible. The survey course, since it samples most of the bill-of-fare of the social sciences, is obviously helpful in this connection. How is one to know whether he might want to go into the public administration branches of engineering if he has had a course in economics but none in government? How is a student to become aware of the possibilities in social work or become oriented toward the criminal law as a career if he has had no introduction to sociology or social psychology? Of course he may learn of these opportunities outside the classroom, but there is no reason why the curriculum should be relieved of all responsibility for vocational guidance.

11. The Development of Critical Intellectual Ability. The most burning issues concerning the survey course doubtless center about its alleged disabilities for the development of the purely intellectual powers of students. The charge is made that the survey presents an ill-digested hodge-podge of subject matter, an unorganized mixture of fact and fiction, which not only does not challenge the student to develop his reasoning faculties but instead actually induces bad mental habits in him. Survey course materials are held to be too easy on the one hand and, since they are supposed to involve large-scale generalizations from superficial data, they are unreliable on the other. Critics assert, too, that the student never gets close enough to the fact-grubbing research process to develop a faculty for judging the reliability of data and that he is not taught how to reason from data to conclusion or to use the conclusions once formed as a means of testing the validity of a systematic theoretical scheme. While these are to some extent contradictory accusations, and also perhaps derived from perfectionist standards, they are serious enough to merit consideration. Since the "training of the mind" is, rightly or wrongly, regarded by most professors as the paramount aim of general education, these objections must be met satisfactorily if the survey is to find a permanent place in college curricula.

Let us consider first the *inductive* side of the reasoning process. It is probably a fair criticism of all elementary courses in social science, surveys included, to say that too little attention is devoted to research methodology, to methods for gathering and testing the data from which the textbook descriptions of social phenomena are derived and upon which conclusions concerning "laws" and "principles" rest. One cannot of course put an elementary student through a complete course in historiography or through detailed consideration of sampling theory, but it may be questioned whether the isolated chapters on scientific method that are found in many textbooks or the few questions on quizzes and examinations that give the student a chance to show a hitherto undeveloped critical faculty are adequate if a ground-work is to be laid for the development of scientific temper and critical acumen in students. Some means must be found of dealing with sources and validities of descriptive data *pari passu* with the presentation of the data themselves if the outcomes just described are to be attained. The syllabus must include constantly recurring questions of the form: "How do you know that what the writer says is true?" and "What alternative conclusions could be drawn from the data presented?"

Some would say that the only way to develop an appreciation of scientific method is actually to put the student at a research problem, necessarily a very small one, but still one in which he gathers and processes raw data for himself. The desirability of this is conceded, and in the more progressive colleges this procedure is followed even in elementary social science courses as it would be as a matter of course in the natural sciences. But if we are clear about the objectives of our science education, we will not despair altogether of the institutions where the size of the elementary classes, or other problems of an administrative sort, make the use of the "research project" method difficult. After all, a general education curriculum does not attempt to train research experts but rather to develop the critical skills necessary to evaluate materials that come to the notice of graduates as they perform the duties of citizenship. This sort of scientific mindedness, a respect for good scientific work in the social sciences and at least some discrimination in separating good from bad, can be acquired without actual research experiences if it has to be. But it cannot be regarded in any sense as an inevitable by-product in the ordinary pedagogical handling of social science materials. Specific attention has to be paid to the task of developing this type of critical ability, and at present the problem is more likely to be attacked successfully in the survey course, which is not bound by tradition in choice of subject matter and procedure, than in the departmental course of the standard type.

Turning now to the *deductive* side of the reasoning process, we must deal first with the classical position that skill in logical thinking can be taught best in courses in mathematics, the classical languages, and philosophy, and that for the social sciences to attempt to do what can be done better

in the older disciplines involves inefficiency and waste of time. Classicists in educational theory profess the belief that a toughness of mental fiber, dialectical skill, clarity in mental processes can be achieved only by requiring the student to master a closely reasoned body of theory or a rigidly logical methodology. Materials appropriate for training the young mind are, it is held, found in much richer measure in the classical fields; indeed the quality of reasoning exhibited in the social sciences is looked down on as distinctly inferior. It follows from this view that the social sciences must find a sort of second-class justification for a place in the curriculum on the basis of their descriptive matter since they cannot compete with the older subjects in developing skills in logical thinking.

That this whole theory of mind training by "mental discipline" in the classical subjects rests upon a naive, unproven, and now largely discredited theory of learning has not prevented a revival of support for it in certain circles in higher education. A great deal of experimental work has now been done on the "transfer of training" and the idea that logical skill developed in dealing with mathematical symbols, systems of metaphysics, or grammatical constructions is automatically transferable to monetary problems, population theories, or jurisprudence is now rejected by all serious students of the learning process. Transfer of concepts, attitudes, and thought processes *can* be attained, where special attention is paid to the broader implications of material under study, and a good teacher of Latin or mathematics, alive to the problems which his students will meet in other fields and eager to help them see the implications of his subject and its characteristic methodology in relation to those problems, may help a great deal in developing competence in those outside areas in which he makes specific applications. However, it is questionable whether the classicist or the physical scientist can ever teach students to think logically with respect to the materials of social science as well, or even nearly as well, as the social scientist himself can do so. The frequently manifested naivete of the most eminent mathematicians, physicists, and classical scholars when they make pronouncements in sociology or economics lends force to this conclusion.

This line of reasoning would seem to require that social scientists do more than describe social phenomena for their students and help them to develop tests for assaying the accuracy of the descriptions offered. They must also help them to learn to think analytically, to put facts and hypotheses together into systems and to make limited predictions therefrom, since this task cannot be performed for them in other departments in the college. How this is to be done is the question. One must not put too much weight on the distinction between inductive and deductive thinking that has been used as a pragmatic device so far in this discussion, and consequently underestimate the amount of logical skill that will be developed simply through acquiring the critical attitude toward data that was described earlier. On the other hand, there is a more abstract type of thinking, an ability to deal

with theoretical materials in the social sciences, whose acquisition would be deemed by many an important educational aim. The role of economic, sociological, and political theory in elementary courses must, therefore, be given some consideration.

(A) *The Role of Formal Theory.* It has been traditional in elementary economics courses to include an introduction to the theory of value and distribution with also some attention paid to monetary theory and to the theory of international exchange. In recent years there has been a minority reaction against this on the part of economists, with some tendency to stress description of economic processes and institutions with beginning students, and to relegate analytical materials to advanced courses. This change of viewpoint has not been very widely adopted but where it has found favor, it has done so probably because of a growing realization of the artificial and in a sense unreal character of much economic theorizing and a rising doubt as to whether skill in handling the systematic theory will have much transfer value in approaching contemporary problems of economic life. That economics majors should develop ability at economic analysis of the traditional sort still goes without much question, but whether the same can be said of the beginner, who may take only one or two courses in the field, is increasingly open to doubt.

If one should conclude that the amount of formal economic theory in elementary courses might well be curtailed, to be replaced by more institutional description and more attention to current economic problems, the same sort of conclusion might be made with still greater assurance in relation to the traditional theoretical materials in elementary sociology courses and in introductory political science. Sociological theory may sometimes be less abstract and unreal than economic theory but it is qualitatively inferior in the complexity and rigorousness of the analysis and is at the present time more unstable and responsive to shifts in what may be called "conceptual fashion." Perhaps for these latter reasons sociological theory is increasingly absent from the introductory textbooks, which are less formally systematic and more full of descriptive materials than they used to be. Much the same thing may be said of beginning texts in political science. The latter contain some material on the nature of the state and of sovereignty and some discussion of legal postulates but all this does not bulk large in comparison with the description of contemporary political institutions and of the dynamics of the political process itself.

If the specialists in the different fields of social science are increasingly willing to see formal theory eliminated, or reduced in amount, in their basic courses they should at the same time be willing to give the survey course greater freedom in this respect. There is no doubt that descriptive subject matter will arouse greater interest in most students, thus increasing learning efficiency and making the fields of the social sciences appear more attractive for further study, but in addition the survey is freed from the difficult task

of
for
lea
lev
the
the
pro
app
cou
diti
of t
A
tion
give
eith
fram
pert
scien
is an
must
pape
cerne
II.
organ
the c
emph
It has
tual
trustw
is to a
"Whe
availa
The
the co
ceptua
studen
It is o
itself i
adjust
theory
further

¹ Cf.
H. Becke
² As

of attempting to integrate the theoretical materials of the three disciplines for beginning students. Not very much progress has yet been made, at least in America, in integrating economic and sociological theory at any level,¹ and oftentimes those who have attempted to make contributions to the problem have been outside the professional academic cults.² Since any theoretical synthesis proposed for a survey course must be acceptable to professors teaching advanced courses in the same institutions, it would appear doubtful whether the introduction of such a synthesis into a beginning course will for a while yet be feasible. Unsynthesized theory of the traditional compartmentalized sort would, on the other hand, be a negation of the survey course's major purpose.

At the risk of repetition it must be made clear, however, that the elimination of theoretical materials (in the conventional sense of the term "theory") gives no license to present an unorganized hodge-podge of descriptive data, either in the departmental course or the survey. There must be a conceptual framework that unifies the material presented and clearly indicates the pertinence of each bit of data included. In fact the ability to select social science materials for relevance and to organize them in meaningful wholes is an intellectual skill whose cultivation must start early, and the survey must do more than set a model; it must provide through questions, term papers, discussions, and other devices for actual practice in the art concerned.

III. The Acquisition of Significant Knowledge. Emphasis upon canons of organization of material leads over into a consideration of criteria governing the choice of material to be organized. What tests of significance should be employed in determining which topics to include and which to leave out? It has been suggested that as far as the aim of developing the sheer intellectual power of the student is concerned any body of well-organized and trustworthy material is almost equally usable since the power developed is to a considerable degree specific to that material. The question is, then, "Where is it most important for the student that intellectual power be available and be applied?"

The intellectualist's answer to this question is often supplied in terms of the concept of "orientation." He wants to equip the student with a conceptualized picture of the civilization they both live in to the end that the student will "understand" his culture and be able to compare it with others. It is often implied that this knowledge about the world he lives in will of itself inevitably and almost automatically lead the student to make a better adjustment to that world and perhaps progressive changes in it. This theory that the well-informed man will become the good citizen without further professorial concern about his life philosophy or his social attitudes

¹ Cf. Talcott Parsons, "Sociological Elements in Economics," in H. E. Barnes and H. Becker, *Contemporary Sociological Theory*, pp. 601-646.

² As for instance Veblen, Mumford, Stuart Chase, Creedy, Thurman Arnold.

is a convenient one, and it still commends itself to many economists and political scientists if not to sociologists. It divests the college teacher of the difficult responsibility of developing a point of view in his students and allows him to retain his reputation for scholarly objectivity among his colleagues. While the views the student acquires will actually be affected by his and his professor's artistic, social, political, vocational, and other biases and their respective positions in the class structure, this fact tends to be glossed over, and when admitted, is thoroughly deplored. Orientation in the conventional college may inadvertently be pro-capitalist, pro-Protestant, pro-intellectualist but an honest effort is usually made to avoid indoctrination and to describe social phenomena in "scientific terms."

It is over the question, which are the most significant aspects of the culture for students, that the orientationists differ. The conventional departmental course orients to abstract and categorized portions of civilization that are labeled "the field of economics," "the field of sociology," etc. and thus leads the student to see the world through the eyes of research experts who have worked out a (for research purposes) convenient division of labor. The survey course avoids this pedagogical error to some degree, and this is its chief educational merit, but it still must face the problem of finding other selection criteria that are more meaningful. The previous paper has enumerated some of the criteria now being experimented with and it is perhaps only worth while to emphasize here that it is the sociologist who may be looked to for the major contribution in solving this problem. He and the historian are the social scientists most used to broad perspectives and with the greatest experience in organizing diverse materials; and with the increasing emphasis on the contemporaneous, upon orientation in modern society, and upon a consideration of modern social problems, the sociologist should logically be entrusted with leadership in survey course construction. The rather low intellectual standing of the sociology discipline in the eyes of brother social scientists has made them loath to trust the sociologist with any such responsibility on most campuses. Doubtless in time the sociologists will improve their rating among scholars, or perhaps the persons chosen to administer surveys will increasingly come to be selected on pedagogical as well as purely scholarly grounds.

A. Common Criticisms: "Superficiality." Before leaving the problem of content in survey courses two common criticisms of the general orientation approach must be dealt with. The first charge is that freshman surveys are superficial, the other that they attempt synthesis too early, before the students are mature enough to undertake such a difficult task. To the latter objection it is perhaps sufficient to point out that postponing any attempt at a unification of social science materials to the senior year (as some advocate) denies the experience to all but departmental majors. By such a policy this relatively small group is asked to acquire a lot of specialized bodies of knowledge on the faith that sometime, when they get to be seniors,

a general over-view which will organize and give significance to much of the material (supposing they still can remember it) will at last be provided for them. This is not to disparage the senior correlation course but only to point out that it is not a substitute for the freshman survey.

The charge of survey course superficiality takes two forms. Some critics allege that the course attempts to cover too much ground and consequently hurries too rapidly over material that needs more time to be grasped by the beginning student. Others have claimed that when the survey concentrates on "big ideas" and "major trends" to the exclusion of detailed supporting material it is superficial in not covering ground enough. These criticisms may represent simply two ways of saying the same thing, although the emphasis in the first is on the student's learning what is set before him and in the second on the possible invalidity of the conclusions he is led to draw from such highly selected subject matter as a "big idea course" involves. The frequency with which both criticisms are repeated evidences deep suspicion of survey courses on the part of scholars.

With respect to the question as to learning efficiency one must admit the danger of jumping from topic to topic, leaving each for another before the student has had time to conceptualize the material and fit it into his framework of thought. This urge to "cover ground" on an outline, to include in the survey all the topics that would be treated in the conventional elementary courses it replaces, provides a temptation to be resisted at all costs. It may be pointed out, however, that departmental elementary courses are also frequently guilty of this same form of superficiality and that elementary texts often seem to try to cover the whole field. What one can learn, and how fast, depends so much on the patterns in which material is organized and the way these patterns relate to student experience, and depends so much also on student interest in the material presented, that it is difficult to set up any standard rates for covering ground at maximum learning efficiency. Critics of the survey course's apparent high speed in handling topics may underestimate the effect of improved classroom instruction and the use of a more meaningful because less academic framework of organization. After all, the learning efficiency of undergraduates in the average course is so low as to give little help in defining a standard of possible performance. It would be more sensible to let the survey course people learn by their own experience in their own new situation what they can expect from students instead of ruling out the survey course approach in advance as inevitable bad pedagogy.

The charges anent the other type of superficiality attributed to survey courses, namely the allegation that they give the student conclusions without the data to support them, that they make of him a shallow-minded person with only a veneer of generalizations to show for his course experience, is hard to deal with because it is difficult to define one's terms. Of course if the student has not familiarized himself with the data and gone

through the intellectual process that leads to the generalization, there is danger that he will take as final truth what the professor realizes is only current expert opinion, in fact hypothesis. On the other hand, the professor, provided with a credulous audience of beginners and encouraged by the survey course outline to let himself go on large-scale judgments and interpretations, may yield to the temptation to sound more authoritative than the state of scientific knowledge justifies or to offer some generalizations half-baked. These are both undoubtedly evils, as thus outlined, and to be avoided as far as possible. But the specific remedies are not easy to state. How much mastery of detailed subject matter should the student acquire before it is safe to let him deal in broad implications and draw conclusions applicable to social policy? How many cautious qualifications must the professor introduce for every general characterization or conclusion he hazards? Our general ignorance of the specific effects on students of any course or type of teaching is still so vast as to make conclusions on these points extremely hazardous. We need to test outcomes of different types of elementary instruction much more thoroughly than has been done so far.

Meanwhile, pending more knowledge of the actual damage done by various degrees of "superficiality" in the outline, some tentative balance has to be struck between the intensive and extensive approaches in planning any course syllabus. The preliminary decisions should be made in the light of the role which the course is supposed to play in the curriculum, and the teaching results checked subsequently by test devices. If the aims of orientation are defined as (1) acquiring the general perspective on culture that has previously been referred to, (2) learning what different kinds of experts there are in the social sciences and what sort of knowledge each can contribute, and (3) developing a few rules of thumb for determining who qualifies, and who does not, for an expert rating, then at least we know what sort of balance to aim at in the social science survey. Such criteria leave the instructor free to be broad and sweeping in his approach without being encyclopaedic but they require that he show *how* his conclusions and generalizations are arrived at even if he does not have time to give much of the detailed data on which they are based. In the course of expounding the methodology which guarantees the accuracy of the descriptive picture he is presenting, the professor will establish his own credibility as an expert and will indirectly provide canons for appraising the claims that others may make to that rating. It was pointed out earlier that in a world of specialists the college graduate can acquire technical competence in but one or two fields of knowledge, yet as a citizen he must constantly rely on generalizations put forth in areas in which he has only general information. In these areas his major problem is often that of knowing whom to trust.

IV. The Acquisition of Desirable Attitudes and Values. Much of the discussion of orientation as an educational aim by college professors is in terms of the intellectualist theory that knowledge is good in itself, that true

kn
wh
pro
sel
ne
div
wh
vin
crit
refe
the
leg
vie
incr
per
sitt
som

L
surv
favo
tion
to b
life
mun
scho
colle
simil
on st
of M
woul

TH
head
the s
issue
of so
opera
youth
trina
call f
diti
gener

* B.
can Co
139-15

knowledge is the result of unbiased and objective description, and that, when selecting from the store of human knowledge those portions to be presented to undergraduates, criteria derived from the subject matter itself should be observed. What is known best and most truly, what fits most neatly into, or rounds out, a systematic scheme, or what is necessary to divide time equally between cooperating disciplines is chosen rather than what the student is most interested in or what is most calculated to convince him about the type of changes needed in the social scene. While criteria of selection derived from student need or interest and from the reform impulses of instructors are never absent in organizing any course in the social sciences their conscious employment is deprecated by most college educators. In secondary and primary schools, however, the point of view is quite different and even higher educational institutions are under increasing pressure to plan courses that are more student-centered and perhaps also more concerned with producing not the intellectual fence-sitter but instead a graduate with a conscious social philosophy giving him some sort of a position toward the various social movements of the day.

Little need be said about this tendency in education and its effect on the survey course except to record its existence, admit the author's bias in favor of accepting some at least of its implications for elementary instruction in the college, and note that its specific implementation remains largely to be worked out. The use as criteria of such "student needs" as "personal life orientation," preparation for leisure, health, the development of communicative skills, has been urged by a group of education experts, and high school social science courses based on this viewpoint have been developed—college professors can if they wish utilize these syllabi as suggestions for a similar development at the college level. Some college courses frankly based on student needs are, in fact, already in operation, notably at the University of Minnesota and at Northwestern.³ Unfortunately, most college people would still look askance at this sort of approach.

The reform interest, if it may be so called, has similarly made little headway in college but is, surprisingly enough, a matter of hot debate in the schools. Those who hold that education cannot be unbiased on social issues have been strengthened in general by the pressure from other types of socio-political regime under which democratic society has recently been operating, and concretely by the seeming bewilderment and apathy of youth in the present crisis. But there is wide variation in the type of indoctrination which the schools are urged to attempt. At the one extreme is a call for a renewed dedication of education to the maintenance of the traditional order, at the other is the insistence that the schools produce a generation of students committed to radical revision of the economic sys-

³ B. L. Johnson, *What about Survey Courses?*, pp. 151-183; *General Education in the American College*, *The Thirty-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, pp. 139-152.

tem and the class structure that goes with it. One in-between position would have the college stress the responsibility to be "informed" on citizenship issues and active in carrying out citizenship duties but would provide no specific guidance on controversial questions. Another would organize courses around social problems that would earlier have been held dangerous but which are now partly sterilized by an attempt to present "all sides."

How long the college's tether is in dealing with social issues is uncertain, and of course varies from institution to institution. Often any deliberate responsibility for attitudinal aspects of the educational process has to be relegated to extra-curricular organizations or to guidance and personnel officers. The latter escape from the cramping limitations of "scholarly standards," use no dangerous textbooks, publish no damning syllabi, and hide in offices where off-campus busybodies cannot find them. They influence life philosophies, value systems, social and political orientations of students directly, leaving the classroom to supply the data for rationalizing the positions logically deduced therefrom. But the classroom does have some influence everywhere and the survey course cannot avoid a decision as to what part it shall play in this important educational process. Since the survey is a recent construct, with fewer conventionalized forms of evasion directly available, it is forced to take a stand on indoctrination and character formation and is indeed much more free than the departmental course to experiment in these new directions. The sociologist on the survey course staff will have to bear the heavier share of responsibility here since he is usually the least allergic to socio-ethical thinking. Doubtless his first move would be to discover how the given survey course is already influencing student attitudes. If professors knew more concretely the effects, or lack of effects, of their teaching on undergraduate political and social behavior, they might be sufficiently horrified to bring the whole matter into the realm of discussion and planning. For objectivity has probably been less a reality than a convenient fiction in most social science instruction.

V. Obstacles. To complete the picture, one should mention a few obstacles, not explicit in the preceding discussion, with which survey course creators are meeting. These obstacles must eventually to a large degree be overcome if the course is to find a secure place in the curriculum.

1. It is proving extremely difficult to recruit competent staffs to teach surveys. Graduate schools turn out specialists, not eclectics, and research men, not teachers. In the social sciences it is especially difficult to find an economist who has any acquaintance with materials outside his own discipline. Most graduate school faculties tend to assume that if a man is any good he should be encouraged to become a research specialist and that the second raters are good enough for survey-course teaching. A partial solution of this difficulty has been the chautauqua-type course, where individual specialists lecture on their own subject matter, but unless there is an adequate staff of quiz masters to provide continuity and integration, this

system works badly. Moreover it is hard to secure these quiz masters because at present there is so little future in this type of teaching. It will only be when college administrators are prepared to recognize good service in the survey course with the same sort of rewards now available to the authors of research monographs that there will be a supply of non-specialized social science instructors created. Meanwhile any one who devotes much time to his responsibilities in a survey course does so at a sacrifice to his future.

2. The survey course in its attempt to cut across departmental lines is likely to run into the worst sort of departmental politics. A successful survey upsets the previous balance of enrollments among departmental elementary courses; it may even completely alter the number of major students which any department attracts. Furthermore, it involves reallocations of staff to carry the interdepartmental teaching load and a consequent possibility of increasing or reducing individual department budgets. When departmental vested interests are challenged, educational reform, as every one knows, becomes extremely difficult of achievement.

3. There is as yet an insufficiency of satisfactory teaching materials for survey courses. Most of the literature available has either been written by specialists for specialists or by non-professional authors whose work, while it may be in some cases entirely suitable for beginning students, is nevertheless suspect by scholars. Textbooks for survey courses are appearing, perhaps prematurely in view of the present lack of crystallization of content. But the difficulty over the lack of materials is not a serious one; the need will undoubtedly be met as the survey course stabilizes.

4. College administrators sometimes regard the survey courses with favor chiefly because they can be made to save money on the cost of instruction. By reducing the number of introductory courses offered and by instituting a greater amount of mass instruction, a tidy budgetary saving may be realized. Mass instruction, however, is no better as an educational technique in survey courses than any place else; in fact it is probably much worse since the task of organizing the material in the mind of the student is greater. Doubtless this difficulty will be resolved, as will the others previously enumerated, if the trend toward the survey course continues.

Official Reports and Proceedings

EDITORIAL NOTE

This issue marks the beginning of my service as Editor. I am deeply grateful to Read Bain for his carrying of the responsibility through the August issue. I think I reflect the feeling of the Society when I say that we all deeply appreciate his four and a half years of painstaking and personally devoted service, and that he has indeed set a high standard for the *Review*.

It is possible that this issue will be a few days late in reaching the members, but the traditional schedule will be adhered to. The reduction of the August number to 128 pages was necessary in the interests of economy and not caused by any shortage of material. We are fortunate to be able to publish 160 pages this time, but we shall have to figure carefully and decide upon the size of each issue in accordance with costs and the reduced budget (see February issue, pp. 70-71, 84). Other measures of economy to prevent the reduction in the amount of material are being considered.

Editorial "Points of interest" are placed at the head of articles in this issue as an experiment. The selection of articles has been made with a view to timeliness and also to concentrate material dealing with certain subjects in a single issue. Several articles in this issue deal with the relation between social roles, attitudes and values; several others with the organization of sociology and social science courses. In these ways and others it is hoped to make the *Review* useful to undergraduate as well as to graduate students and persons working in other fields.

I have appointed Leland C. DeVinney and Thomas C. McCormick as book review editors. DeVinney replaces Howard Becker whose competent service as Book Review Editor we deeply appreciate. I have appointed Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy of Vassar College as Associate Editor. We welcome the two newly elected Assistant Editors, Charles S. Johnson and Dorothy S. Thomas.

I would like to have news from members of the Society who are engaged in war service and doing other special and interesting things. Copy for December issue must go to press October 20. *Notify Conrad Taeuber of any change of address.*

JOSEPH K. FOLSOM

REPORT ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR THE YEAR 1943

In accordance with the provisions of the new Constitution and By-Laws, the Society has completed its first election by mail. Nine hundred and fifty ballots were mailed to members. Of these, 57% were returned to the Chairman of the Committee on Nominations by the time specified, June 15. Although the percentage who participated in the voting may not be as large as some proponents of the election by mail had hoped, I think no one will question that the number of persons who actually took part in the voting this year was greater than at any preceding election of the Society. Last year only 166 members voted.

The Nominating Committee, the membership of which was announced in the February issue of the *Review*, did all of its work by correspondence and prepared a slate which was submitted to the membership, with mail ballots, by May 15, the time specified. The Society owes a debt of gratitude to Professor Carroll D. Clark of the University of Kansas for the able and efficient manner in which he conducted

his work as Chairman of the Committee and to the members of the Committee, as well as to the tellers who assisted in counting the ballots.

The report on the election follows:

"To the President of the American Sociological Society:

"Immediately after the Nominating Committee had been appointed, all the members were circularized and requested to list the names of individuals who should be considered for nomination to office in the Society. The returns were then tabulated and a second letter, giving the results of the first circularization, was sent to each member, with the further request that he indicate his choice for nominees. In the second circularization the returns were sufficiently in agreement to permit the setting up of a ballot for submission to the membership. This ballot was mailed to the members on May 15 and contained the following names:

For President:	Joyce O. Hertzler
	George A. Lundberg
For First Vice-President:	Willard Waller
	Kimball Young
For Second Vice-President:	Thomas C. McCormick
	Samuel A. Stouffer
For Executive Committee:	Floyd N. House
	C. E. Lively
	Thorsten Sellin
	Malcolm Willey
For Assistant Editors:	C. A. Dawson
	Charles S. Johnson
	Dorothy S. Thomas
	Louis Wirth

"The ballots were returned to my office. There the mailing envelopes were verified against the membership list as furnished by the Treasurer and after this verification, the ballots were removed from the mailing envelopes.

"In order to canvass the ballots, I asked the following to serve as tellers: Ernest Manheim, Marston McCluggage, M. Wesley Roper, and Mapheus Smith.

"On June 17 they met in my office at the University of Kansas and proceeded to count the ballots. The following persons received the largest number of votes:

For President:	George A. Lundberg
For First Vice-President:	Kimball Young
For Second Vice-President:	Samuel A. Stouffer
For Executive Committee:	Thorsten Sellin
	Malcolm Willey
For Assistant Editors:	Charles S. Johnson
	Dorothy S. Thomas

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ CARROLL D. CLARK, *Chairman.*"

These, then, are the officers of the Society for the year 1943.

DWIGHT SANDERSON, *President*

COMMITTEE ON SOCIOLOGY IN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

To carry out one of the resolutions adopted at the last annual meeting and with the authority of the Administration Committee, the president of the Society has appointed a Committee on Sociology in Latin American Countries. This committee

has been asked to explore the status of sociology in Latin America and to report to the Society any suggestions it may have on what may be done to improve relations between sociologists in Latin America and the United States and to encourage the development of sociology in Latin America. The committee consists of T. Lynn Smith (Louisiana State University), American Embassy, Rio de Janeiro, *chairman*; Carl C. Taylor (U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics), American Embassy, Buenos Aires; Nathan L. Whetten (University of Connecticut) American Embassy, Mexico City; E. Franklin Frazier, Howard University; W. Rex Crawford, University of Pennsylvania; Clarence Senior, University of Kansas City; and Donald Pierson, Escola Livre de Sociologia e Politica de São Paulo, Brazil.

DWIGHT SANDERSON, *President*

COMMITTEE ANNOUNCEMENT

"At the request of the U. S. Office of Education, President Sanderson appointed a committee to prepare a statement concerning *the role of sociology teaching in relation to the war effort and the post-war reconstruction*. Similar committees are being set up by the other professional societies of social scientists with Lloyd E. Blauch, Senior Education Specialist of the Office of Education as coordinator. The Office of Education undertakes to give the forthcoming reports a circulation among educators and administrators. The committee of the American Sociological Society is as follows: Ruth Reed, Catholic University; Helen Davis, American Council on Education; E. Franklin Frazier, Howard University; Carl Joslyn, University of Maryland; Julian L. Woodward, Office of Facts and Figures, *Chairman*."

SOCIETY REPRESENTATION

Professor J. P. Lichtenberger has been appointed the Society's representative at the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of Villanova College. They are planning various events and celebrations throughout 1942-43 and will hold a centennial convocation on May 3, 1943.

Professor Samuel Joseph, head of the Department of Sociology at the College of the City of New York, will represent the Society at the inauguration of Harry Noble Wright as President of the College of the City of New York, on Wednesday, September 30.

ADDITION TO THE 1942 CENSUS OF RESEARCH¹

XVII. OFFICE OF RADIO RESEARCH 15 AMSTERDAM AVE., NEW YORK CITY

1. Survey of Changes in Political Attitudes during a Presidential Election, Erie County, Ohio
2. Survey of Daytime Radio Listening
3. Measurement of Personal Reactions to Radio Programs
4. Radio and Press Joint-Owner Relationships
5. Studies in Radio and the Printed Page
6. Foreign Language Broadcast Listening Habits of an Enemy Alien Group
7. Methodological Studies of the Panel Technique, and of Interview Bias

¹ As published in August number of the *Review*, pp. 538-554.

SUPPLEMENTAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

- Aginsky, Bernard W., 8 West 13th St., New York, N. Y.
- Beeley, Arthur L., Univ. of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah
- Bicknell, Marguerite E., LeMoyne Col., Memphis, Tenn., B e h i j k
- Blaine, Mrs. Emmons, 101 E. Erie St., Chicago, Ill.
- Bloch, Herbert A., St. Lawrence Univ., Canton, N. Y., A b C j m
- Bruno, Frank J., Washington Univ., St. Louis, Mo.
- Callaghan, Margaret, St. Joseph Col., W. Hartford, Conn., i j N
- Champlin, Mildred Wilder, 34 Ford Av., Oneonta, N. Y.
- Child Welfare League of America, 130 E. 22nd St., New York, N. Y.
- Cleland, Wendell, American Univ. at Cairo, Cairo, Egypt
- Cressey, Paul G., 132 McCosh Rd., Upper Montclair, N. J., B e h i m p
- Croft, Albert E., Univ. of Wichita, Wichita, Kansas
- Cunningham, S. B., Prentice-Hall Co., 70 Fifth Av., New York, N. Y.
- D'Argonne, Michael, Xavier Univ., New Orleans, La.
- Dawson, C. A., McGill Univ., Montreal, Canada
- Detweiler, Frederick G., Denison Univ., Granville, Ohio
- Dietrich, Doris C., 942 Medical Arts Bldg., Tacoma, Wash., d I p
- Dubin, Robert, 5552 S. Maryland, Chicago, Ill.
- Eldredge, H. Wentworth, 2500 Q St., N.W., Washington, D. C.
- English, M. I., (Lieut.), Chanute Field, Illinois
- Fuller, Hugh N. Emory Univ., Georgia
- Fuller, Richard C., Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Gibbs, Raymond L., 1726 Summit, Columbus, Ohio, c i k N
- Hartshorne, Edward Y., 105 Del Ray Av., Bethesda, Md., a b e k m O
- Jones, Harold E., 2683 Shasta Rd., Berkeley, Calif.
- Kahn, Edward M., 318 Capitol Ave., S.E., Atlanta, Ga., b h I k
- Karpf, M. J., Fed. of Jewish Welfare Org., 610 Temple St., Los Angeles, Calif.
- Kepner, Charles D., Aurora, Ohio, A b h i k l m n o
- Kincheloe, Samuel C., 5757 University Ave., Chicago, Ill., b c h i l p
- Koshuk, Ruth Pearson, 5524 Ellis Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Kreuger, E. T., Vanderbilt Univ., Nashville, Tenn.
- Landheer, Bartholomew, 10 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y., a o
- Lobb, John, Box 24, South Hadley, Mass., a k n
- Mansfield, A. Elizabeth, 129 Cliveden Av., Glenside, Pa., h i l n o
- McAleer, James A., 1311 Hampton St., Richmond, Va., c h o
- McCurtain, E. G. (Lieut.), 121 E. 2nd St., Atoka, Oklahoma, N
- Meyer, Henry J., State Col. of Washington, Pullman, Wash., a h p
- Milliken, Robert J., 708 Highland Ave., Washington, D. C.
- Morgan, John W., Fowler Apts., Milledgeville, Georgia
- Mounts, Lewis H., 66 Forest Av., Macon, Georgia, e h J k
- Nottingham, Elizabeth K., Wheaton College, Norton, Mass., a L m
- Ostafin, Peter A., Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., B c h j M P
- Ovenburg, Dorothy C., 4462 St. Paul Blvd., Rochester, N. Y., I
- Parsons, Talcott, 62 Fairmont St., Belmont, Mass.
- Peters, Charles C., Pa. State Col., State College, Pa., b c E f
- Piotrowski, Sylvester A., Mount Mary Col., Milwaukee, Wis., a b g k l
- Reuter, E. B., Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa
- Reynolds, Joseph Weston, Box 357, White Salmon, Wash., c G h I k l m n o P
- Riley, John W., Jr., N. J. Col. for Women, New Brunswick, N. J.
- Robinson, W. S., 423 W. 120th St., New York, N. Y., a B C f g o
- Rowland, Howard, Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio, B e h i m
- Sarvis, G. W., 81 Park Av., Delaware, Ohio, i k n
- Scates, Douglas E., College Station, Durham, N. C.
- Schersten, Albert F., 1000-38th St., Rock Island, Ill.
- Schwitala, Alphonse M., St. Louis Univ., St. Louis, Mo.

- Selle, Erwin S., 323 W. Broadway, Winona, Minn.
 Selling, Lowell S., 16196 Cherrylawn Av., Detroit, Mich.
 Simpson, George E., Pa. State Col., State College, Pa., a h
 Slawson, John, 228 E. 19th St., New York, N. Y.
 Taylor, John Edward, 429 W. Walnut St., Lancaster, Pa., A c o
 Woodbury, Robert M., McGill Univ., Montreal, Canada
 Woodward, Comer M., Emory University, Ga., a g i k
 Wyatt, Donald W., 1321 Franklin St., N.E., Washington, D. C.

NEW MEMBERS

- Basehart, Harry W., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., b c H k m
 Berkman, Paul L., 3417 A St., S.E., Washington, D. C.
 Beth, Marianne W., 5707 Woodlawn, Chicago, Ill., a b k l m N
 Brown, Warren H., 272 Jefferson Ave. Brooklyn, N. Y., c o
 Brunsmann, Howard G., Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C., F
 Butts, Frances N., 508 E. Cottage Grove, Bloomington, Ind.
 Copeland, Lewis C., Fisk Univ., Nashville, Tenn., a B c f h
 Davis, Elnora D., Md. State Teachers College, Bowie, Md., c G h k m
 Harrison, Walter R., 6376-30-St., Detroit, Mich., b C g l
 Hatch, David L., 187 Grove St., Wellesley, Mass., a g h k
 Houser, Mr. & Mrs. Paul M., 817 N. Ball St., Owosso, Mich., a b c h I J k m
 Humphreys, Alexander J., Univ. of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.
 James, Clayton L., State Teachers Col., Murfreesboro, Tenn., g h i j k m
 Kendall, Patricia, 37-43 88th St., Jackson Hts., L. I., N. Y., a c F
 Kildow, Monroe, Box 520, Tiffin, Ohio, b d g k l M
 Lewin, Kurt, Child Welfare Research Sta., Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa
 Loeb, Ruth, 13 Bartlett St. Waterville, Maine, b i k
 Maria, Sister Loretta, Col. of St. Elizabeth, Convent, N. J.
 Moore, Barrington, Jr., Casanova, Virginia
 Rutes, Vivian Lee, 849 Linden Blvd., Brooklyn, N. Y., b d I m
 Smith, Bruce Lannes, 1016-6th Street, N.W., Washington, D. C.
 Solomon, Edward C., Alabama College, Montevallo, Ala.
 Waggoner, M. A., Northwestern State Col., Alva, Oklahoma, A n o
 Weinrich, Max, Yiddish Scientific Inst., 425 Lafayette St., New York, N. Y., B o
 Whyman, Alex J., 114 E. 32nd St., New York, N. Y., a n
 Williams, Robin M., Univ. of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky., b c d G

PRELIMINARY PROGRAM OF THE THIRTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING

The Thirty-Seventh Annual Meeting will be held at the Hollenden Hotel, Cleveland, Ohio, December 29 to 31, 1942. Note that this is one day later than previously announced. The change has been made at the suggestion of the Office of Defense Transportation to avoid week end travel. The Committee on Local Arrangements consists of: J. E. Cutler, Chairman, Henry M. Busch, C. E. Gehlke, Rex M. Johnson, A. A. Johnston, James T. Laing, N. N. Puckett, G. W. Sarvis, and Newell L. Sims.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 29, 8:30 A.M.

Registration.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 29, 9:00-10:00 A.M.

Business Meeting for reports of committees and representatives of the Society.

S
 Te
 "C
 syl
 P
 "C
 Rob
 Defe
 "T
 Flor
 "P
 Esth
 Co
 Corn
 Ru
 Ge
 siding
 "T
 Unive
 "Po
 Mead
 "TH
 Relati
 Dis
 Ru
 Soci
 "Cla
 C. Wri
 "Cor
 Merton
 Com
 Roun
 Some R
 * Mee

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 29, 10:00-12:00 A.M.

Social Psychology. Kimball Young, Queens College, Chairman.

"Some Problems in Field Interviews When Using the Control-Group Technique in the Community." F. Stuart Chapin, University of Minnesota.

"The Validity of the Imputation of Motives." George Simpson, Pennsylvania State College.

Population. Elbridge Sibley, U. S. Bureau of the Budget, Chairman.

"The Tolan Committee's Researches on Wartime Migration," Herbert Roback, Research Staff of the House Committee Investigating National Defense Migration.

"Movements of the Negro Population in 1917-18 and in 1941," Lyonel C. Florant, Virginia State Planning Board Population Study.

"Relocation of Japanese Residents and Its Social Consequences," Mrs. Esther W. Staudt, War Department.

Conference on General Social Science Course. Julian L. Woodward, Cornell University, Chairman. Program to be arranged.

Rural Sociological Society.* Impact of the War upon Community Life.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 29, 1:00-3:00 P.M.

General Session. Katharine Jocher, University of North Carolina, Presiding.

"The War and the American Negro Minority," Charles S. Johnson, Fisk University.

"Potential Changes in the Status of Women during the War," Margaret Mead, American Museum of Natural History.

"The Effect of the War on Minority Groups in This Country and Their Relation to It," Gerhart Saenger, College of the City of New York.

Discussant: Louis Wirth, University of Chicago.

Rural Sociological Society.* Farm Population and the War.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 29, 3:00-5:00 P.M.

Social Theory. Theodore Abel, Columbia University, Chairman.

"Class, Occupation, Status: Problems of 'The New Middle Class'," C. Wright Mills, University of Maryland.

"Comparative Perspectives in Research on Class Structure," Robert Merton, Columbia University. Discussion.

Community and Ecology. A. B. Hollingshead, Chairman.

Round Table, "Methodological and Theoretical Contributions Made by Some Recent Community Studies."

* Meetings designated by the asterisk are not under the direct auspices of the Society.

"The Yankee City Series," Howard Becker, University of Wisconsin.

"Stability-Mobility Studies in the Department of Agriculture Rural Life Series," Everett C. Hughes, University of Chicago.

"Community Studies in the Deep South," Robert N. Ford, Mississippi State College.

The Family. Joint session with the National Conference on Family Relations, Robert G. Foster, Merrill-Palmer School, Chairman.

Topic: Problems of Marriage in Wartime, Meyer Nimkoff, Bucknell University, Presiding.

"Changing Cultural Patterns Evident in American Family Life and Some Indicated Post-war Adjustments," Margaret Mead, American Museum of Natural History.

Discussant, John Dollard, Yale University.

"Legal Problems of Marriage Created by the War Situation," Max Rhinestein, Law School, University of Chicago

Discussant, E. Dana Brooks, Director, Division of Domestic Relations, Common Pleas Court, Cleveland, Ohio.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 29, 4:30 P.M.

Meeting of the Executive Committee.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 29, 8:00 P.M.

General Session. Harold A. Phelps, University of Pittsburgh, Presiding.

"Changing Concepts in Democratic Ideology," Frank H. Hankins, Smith College.

"The Sociologist in the Rôle of Prophet," E. A. Ross, University of Wisconsin.

Discussants: Read Bain, Miami University. Mildred Fairchild, Bryn Mawr College.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 9:00-10:00 A.M.

Business Meeting of the Society.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 10:00-12:00 A.M.

Measurement in Sociology. C. Horace Hamilton, North Carolina State College, Chairman.

"An Approach to the Quantification of Classes of Attributes," Louis N. Guttman, Cornell University.

"Statistical Methods for Regional Delineation," Margaret Jarman Haggood, University of North Carolina.

Discussants: William Fuson, University of Michigan. Howard R. Cottam, Pennsylvania State College.

Social Control of Labor Relations. Joint Session with American Association for Labor Legislation. John M. Carmody, Member U. S. Maritime Commission, Presiding.

"The Public Viewpoint," Elbert Thomas, Chairman, United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

m

R

R

M

lon

ger

C

tiv

tor

"S

Dir

D

Iow

S

"

Rob

"

Log

"

of M

T

Asso

versi

"M

tion

"T

Fleis

Di

Klee

* M

"Industry's Viewpoint," Alvin E. Dodd, President, American Management Association.

"Labor's Viewpoint," Robert Watt, American Federation of Labor.

Discussants: To be announced.

Rural Sociological Society.* The Health and Physical Competence of the Rural Population.

The Family. Joint Session with the National Conference on Family Relations. Topic: Wartime Trends Affecting Work with Families, Adolph Meyer, Johns Hopkins University, Presiding.

"The Function of Marriage Counselling During Wartime," Gladys Gaylord, Maternal Health Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

Discussant, Mrs. Emily Mudd, Marriage Counsel, Philadelphia, Pa.

"What is Good Mental Hygiene for the Family During the War Emergency," Caroline Zachry, New York University.

Discussant, Kimball Young, Queens College.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1:00-3:00 P.M.

General Session. Community Organization for War and Post-War Activities.

"The Civilian Front in War-Time," Jonathan Daniels, Assistant Director, Office of Civilian Defense.

"Local Organization for War and Peace in Rural Areas," M. L. Wilson, Director of Extension, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Discussants: Stuart A. Queen, Washington University. Ray E. Wakeley, Iowa State College.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 3:00-5:00 P.M.

Social Psychology.

"Social Psychological Aspects of Farmer-Bureaucracy Relationships," Robin Williams, University of Kentucky.

"Sociability and Insight in Psychotic Patients," Mary Bess Owen, Logansport (Ind.) State Hospital.

"A Social Psychological Theory of Hypnosis," T. H. Sarbin, University of Michigan.

The Challenge of Industry to Sociology. Joint Session with American Association for Labor Legislation. Grace L. Coyle, Western Reserve University, Presiding.

"Migratory Labor," Carey McWilliams, California Division of Immigration and Housing.

"The Impact of War Employment on the Community," Alexander Fleisher, National Resources Planning Board.

Discussants: Richard C. Fuller, University of Michigan. Mary van Kleeck, Russell Sage Foundation.

* Meetings designated by the asterisk are not under the direct auspices of the Society.

Population.

"The Occupational Adjustment of One Thousand Selectees," Eli Ginsberg, School of Business, Columbia University.

Other papers to be arranged.

Discussants to be announced.

Community and Ecology.

"Ecological and Social Structure in a Slum Area," William F. Whyte, University of Oklahoma.

"The Impact of War on Some Communities in the Southwest," E. D. Tetreau, University of Arizona.

"A Wisconsin Rural Community: Merrimac," Will H. Moody, University of Wisconsin.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 4:30 P.M.

Meeting of the Executive Committee.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 8:00 P.M.

General Session of the Society. Joint session with the Rural Sociological Society and the National Conference on Family Relations. J. E. Cutler, Western Reserve University, Presiding.

"Sociology in the Service of Agriculture and Rural Life," C. E. Lively, University of Missouri, President of the Rural Sociological Society.

"Sociology a Means to Democracy," Dwight Sanderson, Cornell University, President of the American Sociological Society.

"The Impact of the War upon Marriage and the Family," Ernest W. Burgess, University of Chicago, President of the National Conference on Family Relations.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 31, 9:00-11:00 A.M.

Social Theory. Theodore Abel, Columbia University, Chairman.

"The Relation of Sociology and Anthropology," Howard Becker, University of Wisconsin.

Panel Discussion: Robert A. Nisbet, University of California; James W. Woodward, Temple University; Florian Znaniecki, University of Illinois; and others.

Sociology in Business and Industry. Henry Pratt Fairchild, New York University, Chairman.

"Are There Societal Technicians in Business?" Alfred McClung Lee, Wayne University.

Paper by Henry G. Weaver, General Motors Corporation, Detroit.
Discussion.

Rural Sociological Society.* Farm Laborers in War-Time.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 31, 11:00 A.M.

Business Meeting of the Society.

* Meetings designated by the asterisk are not under the direct auspices of the Society.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1:00-2:45 P.M.

Measurement in Sociology. C. Horace Hamilton, North Carolina State College, Chairman.

"Experiments with Repeated Interviews in Different Fields of Public Opinion Research," Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Office of Radio Research, Columbia University.

"The Effect of Specific New Events on Morale as Determined by Repeated Tests," Robert E. L. Faris, Department of Sociology, Bryn Mawr College.

"Suggestions on Methods of Measuring Rates of Change among Institutions," C. Arnold Anderson and Bryce Ryan, Iowa State College.

Discussants: F. Stuart Chapin, University of Minnesota. George A. Lundberg, Bennington College.

Contributed Papers. Howard W. Beers, University of Kentucky, Chairman.

"Acculturation of an Arab-Syrian Community in the Deep South," Afif I. Tannous, University of Minnesota. And others to be arranged.

Other papers to be announced.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 31, 2:45-4:30 P.M.

Criminology. J. P. Shalloo, University of Pennsylvania, Chairman.

"Effects of the War on Juvenile Delinquency," George Gardner, M.D., Director Judge Baker Guidance Center, Boston, Mass.

"War and Adult Criminality," Walter Bromberg, M.D., Former Senior Psychiatrist Court of General Sessions, New York City.

"Prisoners' Attitudes Toward the War," Wilson M. Meeks, Sociologist, Joliet (Ill.) Penitentiary.

"The Habitual Criminal," George K. Brown, St. Lawrence University.

Sociometry. George A. Lundberg, Bennington College, Presiding.

"Sociology and Social Measurement," Read Bain, Miami University.

"The Relation of Sociometry to Social Measurement and to the Social Sciences," S. C. Dodd, American University of Beirut.

Discussants: To be announced.

Round Table on Social Problems in the Housing of War Workers. J. B. Maller, Federal Public Housing Authority, Presiding.

Participants: Members of the Society's Committee on the Social Aspects of Housing; Warren J. Vinton, Federal Public Housing Authority; Francis Brown, American Council on Education; Howard G. Brunsman, U. S. Bureau of the Census; Louis Wirth, University of Chicago; and others.

Committee on Conceptual Integration.* Raymond V. Bowers, University of Rochester, presiding.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 31, 4:30 P.M.

Meeting of the New Executive Committee.

* Meetings designated by the asterisk are not under the direct auspices of the Society.

CURRENT ITEMS

U. S. Bureau of the Census. Director J. C. Capt of the Bureau of the Census has announced the appointment, effective July 1, 1942, of Dr. Philip M. Hauser as Assistant Director of the Census Bureau. Dr. Hauser will be in charge of social statistics in the Bureau, including population and housing statistics, vital statistics, the census of agriculture, and statistics relating to state and local government. Dr. Henry D. Sheldon, Jr., of the staff of the Sociology Department at the University of Rochester, has accepted a position in the Population Division of the Census Bureau.

U. S. Department of State. "Two distinguished Argentineans are in Washington for a two months' tour of this country at the invitation of the Department of State. Dr. Teodora Becu, the well known man of letters and adviser to the Lozada publishing firm, arrived by air on July 3, and Dr. Sebastián Soler, Professor of Law at the University of Córdoba and Judge of the Court of Appeals of Rosario, arrived on July 4. Dr. Becu has represented his country as official delegate to the International Aeronautical Congress in Rome in 1922 and to the World Monetary and Economic Congress in London in 1933. He is an active member of the Society of Argentine Bibliophiles and a past editor of *The Juridical and Social Science Review* of Buenos Aires. He has published two books and several monographs on banking. Dr. Soler is well known as a penalist and is an outstanding authority on juvenile delinquency. While in this country he will give special attention to juvenile courts and reform schools."

American Council on Education. With the release this month of *Selected Educational Motion Pictures: A Descriptive Encyclopedia*, an entirely new type of educational film catalog becomes available for teachers and administrators. This encyclopedia has been prepared and published by the Motion Picture Project under the Committee on Motion Pictures in Education, Ben G. Graham, chairman. Its purpose "is to facilitate the effective utilization of films in the curriculum of American schools and colleges. It contains essential information on approximately 500 16-mm. motion pictures selected as a result of the classroom use of films during the Project's five-year evaluation program. The encyclopedia is selective, not exhaustive. The films included are not claimed to be the 500 best films for general education, but 500 films that have been reported as valuable when used for specific purposes." The *Encyclopedia* is available from the American Council on Education, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. It sells for \$3.00.

The Australian Institute of Sociology has just been formed. Its purpose and activities will be very similar to those of the American Sociological Society. It would be glad to establish relations with us and to interchange information. One of its own first pieces of work will be to publish for Australian consumption, a Digest of sociological research carried out in other parts of the world, in order to create an informed opinion and to stimulate interest in social research in Australia. [From a letter to Dr. Phelps from Aileen Fitzpatrick, Prudential Building, 5 Hamilton Street, Sydney, Australia.]

National Council for the Social Studies. A conference on "Social Education in Wartime and After" will be held in New York City during the Thanksgiving holidays, November 26-28. Government officials and social scientists will meet with teachers from elementary and secondary schools to consider what policies and practices should govern social-studies teaching in the United States during the war. Conclusions of the conference will subsequently be published by the National Council. Anyone interested in attending all or part of the conference should write for further information to Wilbur F. Murra, executive secretary, National Council for the Social Studies, 1201 Sixteenth St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

The Rural Settlement Institute. Heinrich Infeld, who taught last year at City College of New York and was visiting professor at Columbia University, has been appointed executive director of the Rural Settlement Institute. Founded by Edward A. Norman, honorary presi-

dent of the New York State Credit Union League, the Institute has sponsored field studies of significant developments in the field of cooperative settlement, such as in the Palestinian Kvutzah and the cooperative farms of the Farm Security Administration. The testimony before the Senate Sub-Committee on Appropriations, given by research director Joseph W. Eaton, has been given the credit for eliminating the clause against cooperative farming projects from the Agricultural Appropriations Bill for 1943. A Bibliography and Research Guide on cooperative group farming, prepared by members of the staff of the Institute, is being published by the H. W. Wilson Co., N. Y. C.

Sperry Gyroscope Company, Brooklyn, N. Y. Delbert Miller, whose article appears in this issue, writes as follows. "Washington State has given me a year's leave of absence to serve as Conference Training Supervisor at Sperry. All supervisors from plant managers to leaders meet in conference to discuss their common problems. Conferences serve as a clearing house for criticisms and recommendations. Top management in turn uses the Supervisory Conference Plan as a channel to present possible policy changes to its supervisors. In the six weeks I have been here I have been impressed with the way in which unskilled workers can be adapted to the work of making precision instruments. I have seen women from the ten cent stores and just out of ready to wear be put to work on engraving of instruments one week after reporting to work."

Harvard University. The degree of Master of Arts in Teaching established at Harvard in 1936 has now been reorganized. Taking account of undergraduate studies in Education, the program now makes it fully possible for competent students from good colleges to attain the degree after one year of graduate study at Harvard.

Iowa State College. C. Arnold Anderson presents a memorandum prepared by a committee from the Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station and Extension Service at the request of the Story County Council of Defense. This memorandum deals with Opportunities and Responsibilities of the County Defense Council; General Program for Civilian War Participation; Some Things that can be Done at Once; Specific Programs; Next Steps in County and Community Organization for War Work Community Mobilization. It is an unusually clear and concrete statement of a program of community organization for defense which might serve as a guide to other communities. It is available in mimeographed form, 10 pages.

University of Kansas. Dr. Loren C. Eiseley has been promoted from assistant professor to associate professor of Anthropology. Under a research grant from the University of Kansas, he will work this summer at the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, completing a project in physical anthropology undertaken during a post-doctoral fellowship awarded him by the Social Science Research Council in 1940-41.

Michigan State College. Dr. Charles R. Hoffer, of the Department of Sociology at Michigan State College, was a member of the summer staff at West Virginia University. Dr. J. Howard Howson, of Vassar, again taught the summer course on Marriage at Michigan State. Approximately 100 seniors and graduate students are enrolled in the two sections which are offered.

University of Missouri. Professor C. E. Lively was elected president of the Rural Sociological Society at its annual meeting in New York last December. Brewton Berry, associate professor of sociology, has been elected a fellow of the Society of American Archeology, and has been awarded a grant-in-aid by the Social Science Research Council for the preparation of a book on the Indians of Missouri.

Ronald B. Almack has resigned as instructor in rural sociology, and has accepted a position with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, in the Milwaukee, Wis., Regional Office. Harold Kaufmann, who received his bachelor's and master's degrees at the University of Missouri, and will receive his Ph.D. from Cornell in August, has been appointed instructor in rural sociology. Forrest Kellogg, who has been instructor in sociology, has resigned to accept a position as assistant professor at Texas A. and M. College.

George Blair and J. R. Bertrand, research assistants, have resigned to accept commissions in the Army and Navy, respectively; and their positions have been taken by Annabelle White-

side, B.A., Miss. State College for Women, and W. W. Morse, B.A., M.A., Columbia University.

University of North Carolina. Dr. Margaret Jarman Hagood, research associate in the Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina, and associate professor of social statistics, has been appointed senior social scientist and head of the Section on Population in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in the Department of Agriculture, at Washington. This work carries with it important responsibility in the study of population in the United States and especially in rural-urban migration and in the study of farm people. Dr. Hagood will also teach certain courses in statistics in the Graduate School of the Department of Agriculture.

St. Cloud Teacher's College, Minnesota. 1st Lieut. Leslie D. Zeleny, who served in the Air Force in World War I, is now in training at the Officers' Training School, Army Air Corps, Miami Beach, Fla.

Temple University. At the request of the Federal Department of Justice, Negley K. Teeters has been given permission by the university to make a survey of the Federal prisons in several states. He has been requested to evaluate the treatment program developed for Federal prisoners at penitentiaries in Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Georgia and Kentucky. After a six-weeks tour of the prisons, Teeters will return to Washington and file his report with the Department of Justice.

Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Dean H. L. Price and Leland B. Tate have introduced what is believed to be the first Basic Rural Sociology course arranged for freshmen in any college of agriculture. Under an accelerated war-time program three sections of the course were given this summer, and will be repeated during the fall quarter. Associate professor C. L. Folse, now on leave of absence, is an infantry officer attached to the Air Corps at Bolling Field, D. C. Emerson Books, Inc., of New York, have announced the publication of a book by assistant professor John Newton Baker entitled, *Sex Education in High Schools*. This is a survey of the experiences of high schools with their courses in sex education.

Researchers W. E. Garnett and Allen Edwards, of the Agricultural Experiment Station, are cooperating with various state agencies, in making studies of population pressure and of rural health and nutrition. They have recently completed studies of marginal population, rural youth, and sample Virginia communities. William H. Roney, research assistant, left recently for Washington to begin service with the Civilian Training Division of the U. S. Army Signal Corps. W. W. Eure, assistant in rural sociology extension work, is in Army service and stationed at Fort Monroe, Va.

Washington University. L. L. Bernard gave two courses at the University of California, at Berkeley, during the summer session: Social Psychology and the Sociology of War. He reports that the enrollment was large and the climate wonderful.

University of Wisconsin. The Book Review Department of The *American Sociological Review* is now under the editorship of Professors Leland C. DeVinney and Thomas C. McCormick, both of Wisconsin. Professor DeVinney replaces Howard Becker as editor.

Professor Becker has become editor of the D. C. Heath Social Relations Series of textbooks. The first text in this series will be entitled, *Marriage and the Family*, which is edited by Howard Becker and Reuben Hill, and which is a symposium growing out of the Marriage and Family course at the University of Wisconsin.

In the curriculum of the Department of Sociology, a new division has been drawn up to cover the field of population. Mr. Milton Yinger has been appointed instructor in Sociology at Ohio Wesleyan.

The District of Columbia Chapter of the American Sociological Society will meet on October 27 at 7:15 p.m., as the guest of George Washington University. The meeting will include a panel discussion of Measurement of American War-Time Attitudes; participants are: S. A. Stouffer, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., Carl Hoveland, John W. Riley, Jr. The Secretary of the Chapter is Professor John B. Holt of the University of Maryland.

BOOK REVIEWS

BOOK REVIEW EDITORS

LELAND C. DEVINNEY AND THOMAS C. MCCORMICK
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin

Dodd: <i>Dimensions of Society. A Quantitative Systematics for the Social Sciences.</i> E. T. Bell.	707
Dodd: <i>Dimensions of Society. A Quantitative Systematics for the Social Sciences.</i> Talcott Parsons.	709
MacIver: <i>Social Causation.</i> Donald W. Calhoun.	714
Warner and Lunt: <i>The Status System of a Modern Community, Yankee City Series, Volume II.</i> Morr's Edward Opler.	719
Goodwin: <i>The Social Organization of the Western Apache.</i> Morris Edward Opler.	723
Opler: <i>An Apache Life-Way.</i> Florian Znaniecki.	724
Leyburn: <i>The Haitian People.</i> Charles Rogler.	726
Gist: <i>Secret Societies: A Cultural Study of Fraternalism in the United States.</i> Ruth Benedict.	728
Anderson: <i>Desert Saints: The Mormon Frontier in Utah.</i> Vardis Fisher.	730
Dwyer: <i>The Gentile Comes to Utah.</i> J. E. Hulett, Jr.	732
Nottingham: <i>Methodism and the Frontier. Indiana Proving Ground.</i> J. Milton Yinger.	733
Pope: <i>Millhands and Preachers.</i> S. H. Hobbs, Jr.	733
Russell: <i>The History of Quakerism.</i> Allan W. Eister.	735
Wright and Tinling: <i>The Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover, 1709-1712.</i> Floyd N. House.	736
Agard: <i>What Democracy Meant to the Greeks.</i> R. A. Schermerhorn.	737
Alamic: <i>Two-Way Passage.</i> Richard Dewey.	739
Fell: <i>The Foundations of Nativism in American Textbooks, 1783-1860.</i> Franz H. Mueller.	740
Lafitte: <i>The Internment of Aliens.</i> Gottfried Salomon.	741
Johnson: <i>Prisoners of War.</i> Jerome Davis.	742

Dimensions of Society. A Quantitative Systematics for the Social Sciences. By STUART CARTER DODD. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942. Pp. vii+944. \$12.00.

NOTE: Because of the technical mathematical aspects of *Dimensions of Society* it has seemed advisable to have it reviewed both by a mathematician and by a sociologist. The two reviews follow.

The editors asked only for an appraisal, by a working mathematician, of the mathematics in this book. This notice will be confined strictly to the mathematical aspect of the "S-theory" which the book expounds. To substantiate the conclusion reached, it will be necessary first to recall some of the salient characteristics of a mathematical theory of any science, and to point out what such a theory reasonably may be expected to accomplish. It is to be borne in mind that this summary refers to mathematics as it is, not as it may become, and to the existing applications of mathematics to the sciences. If a theory lacks the characteristics noted, it is not thereby neces-

sarily wrong, trivial, or useless; it merely is not mathematical, and to describe it as mathematical is to press provocative familiarities on reputable language.

A mathematical theory proceeds by strict deductive reasoning from certain explicitly stated assumptions. The reasoning usually is, but need not be, carried on in a symbolism differing from the verbal symbols of common language. The undefined terms in the postulates of the theory may be further described or explained in popular terms; but any such explication of the meaning of the postulates is outside the theory and plays no part in its formal development. Until the postulates have been stripped of verbiage and displayed where anyone seeing them can recognize at a glance what is being assumed, the mathematics has not begun. The reference on page 3 notwithstanding, the postulates on which the S-theory is based appear to be somewhat elusive, if indeed there are any.

Mathematical symbolism has two chief functions. First, it usually condenses certain verbal expressions and fixes their meaning. Second, it is in some degree algoristic. The second feature is that which distinguishes mathematics from stenography, which possesses the first characteristic to a slight extent. The data of a given situation may, conceivably, be symbolized in any one of an indefinite number of ways. The simpler the symbols used the better. But this is only the tentative first step; and no matter how ingeniously contrived, or how readily apprehended the symbols may be, there is no mathematics about them until processes for combining the symbols, according to standardized rules devised once for all, have been prescribed. If the symbolism is not to be utterly barren, the rules must be such that, when applied to given combinations of symbols, new and *interpretable* combinations, not immediately obvious, result; in short, the symbolism must be inherently creative.

A well devised symbolism will suggest operations to be performed on the symbols; the operations will then reveal unsuspected affinities between the symbols. Pure and applied mathematics abound in these creative algorithms. There is no more pathetic misapprehension of the nature and function of mathematics than the trite cliché that mathematics is a shorthand. If mathematics were nothing more than that, it would be a sterile formalism incapable of generating the least of the great theories of mathematical physics. To sum up: mere symbolization of any discipline is not even a respectable parody of mathematics; and until something creative is done with the symbols, there is no reason to suppose that a particular symbolization stands the slightest chance of being mathematically useful. For all its symbols, a theory may take the name of mathematics in vain.

The foregoing remarks may be pointed by three specific instances, all alluded to in the book. The author asks (p. 918), "Can tensor theory be applied to S-theory?" In all reverence it may be suggested that God alone knows, and that the mere mathematical man is not likely to find out until, if ever, something of the spirit and the technical apparatus of tensor theory, more useful than its picturesque language, is introduced into S-theory. What makes tensors prized in physics are such humdrum details of mathematical technique as contraction and covariant differentiation, which

mechanically generate new tensors from given tensors, and which more than once have surprised the exploring physicist by disclosing things he had not anticipated were concealed in the symbolism. Similarly for sociological vectors as protomathematics: what shall it profit a sociologist, or anyone else, to dub a certain object a vector when the object in question has, at a very doubtful best, only the most trivial of all properties of vectors? And what, precisely, is gained by exhibiting an impressive-looking societal matrix when nothing is done with it, and the matrix has in common with the matrices used by mathematicians and physicists only its deceptively suggestive name? Is there any point in talking learnedly of "reducing the rank of the matrix" (Note 12, p. 439) until it has been shown that "the rank of the matrix" is more than a meaningless collocation of words in S-theory? Or, to contrast the symbolism itself with its invoked congener, the symbolism of mathematical logic: that symbolism does not stop with the proposal that the logical "or," "and" be denoted by the "plus," "times" of algebra; it continues, and shows that when classes or propositions are combined according to the algebraic rules connoted by "addition," "multiplication," the outcome automatically *makes sense*. The S-theory has yet to take its first step toward a generative mathematical symbolism. No number of imposing references to highly cultivated fields of mathematics, and no reckless abuse of the mathematical vocabulary, can of themselves transform a theory not yet mathematical into anything more substantially mathematical than a feeble mathematical pun.

The "Research Suggestions" (Appendix III) contain several queries relating to possibilities for mathematical developments, for example, "Can dimensional analysis of societal situations be used, as dimensional analysis is used in Physics . . . ?," with a citation of P. W. Bridgeman (*sic*), *Dimensional Analysis*. Offhand, a mathematician would say, probably not, at least until someone can give a meaningful answer to such exactly analogous questions as, "How many yards of buttermilk does it take to make a pair of britches for a bull?" Such queries as some of those in "Research Suggestions" may seem profound to the mathematically uninitiated; to at least one mathematician by trade they seem profoundly pretentious.

The reader's difficulties will not be of a mathematical nature; for beyond a chapter on the classical theory of correlation, there is no mathematics in the book. As for the "geometric technic" (pp. 64-65, 119-120) consisting in translating S-theory into terms of vectors with their points, lines, and angles, it seems to fritter out in a new "verbalistic nebulosity" (p. 120), evaporating finally in an unimplemented aspiration for a mathematical theory of human relationships. Only sociologists can say whether this is what they want. If it is, the book offers no hint of how to produce the theory, desirable or otherwise as it might be, beyond repeated exhortations similar to those which urge the faithful to get to Heaven if they can.

E. T. BELL

California Institute of Technology

In his own explicit terms the author of this exceedingly formidable work regards as its most important contribution towards building up a science of

sociology, the "organizing of sociological concepts into a consistent system." "The claim is made here that S-theory, whatever else its inadequacies may be, does develop such a *system* (italics in text) for the sociological segment of knowledge, better than any other sociological system offered to date" (p. 839). Is this very far-reaching claim justified? The reviewer's opinion is quite definitely that it is not, if by "better" be understood promising to make greater contributions to the systematic generalized analysis of social phenomena.

In the sense of the great tradition of science, in that in which the classical mechanics or the physico-chemical system of Willard Gibbs are systems, Professor Dodd does not really develop a theoretical system at all, even in its beginnings, but only what may be called a "language." With his "S-theory" as a conceptual tool he is able in a logically consistent way to formulate many concepts, to describe many classes of empirical phenomena in certain ways, and to undertake certain kinds of limited analyses of interrelationships, for the most part of the sort which are already well known in statistical fields. On that level Dodd, besides his ingenious treatment of many particular problems, has probably accomplished a work of systematization, in that he has brought within a single scheme of notation many different fields which have previously not been unified in that way. How far this is an important contribution, and conversely, in what difficulties Dodd becomes involved in making it, the present reviewer is not highly competent to judge, and will not attempt to do so here.

But it is quite clear that S-theory is totally incapable of even approaching the level of generalized dynamic analysis which is the great achievement of the systems cited from the history of the physical sciences, or even the much more modest level attained in such sciences as physiology, dynamic psychology, or certain fields of social science, all of which latter use a "structural-functional" approach to the problem of formulating a system. It is the contention of this review that, in this context of the meaning of system, not only can Dodd's claim to have offered the best available system not be admitted, but general adoption of S-theory would positively impede the achievement of the highest levels of generalized analysis attainable in the present state of the subject.

A theoretical system in the "classical" sense is of course a conceptual scheme, a set of logically interrelated and consistent concepts—a category into which Dodd's S-theory also falls. But it is a conceptual scheme of a particular type in which S-theory is not included. The interrelated concepts of a true theoretical system are adapted to the systematic description and analysis of any one of a class of "empirical systems," of phenomena which are interdependent in such a way that the system "behaves" or "functions" in some important sense and degree as a whole, as a unit. Classical examples are the solar system, the physico-chemical system of the blood, and the organism as treated by the physiologist. The scientific function of the theoretical system is precisely to make dynamic analysis of the behavior of the empirical system *as a whole* possible, thereby eliminating certain of the dangerous forms of abstraction inherent in a "one at a time" analytical

procedure. One fundamental condition of the determinacy of a theoretical system is the adequacy with which it defines, and provides a set of generalized categories for the description of, the relevant class of empirical systems—that is, contains a “generalized system” on the descriptive level.

This is the first fundamental point at which Dodd’s system breaks down. It is far too general to describe a determinate class of systems. Two of its basic “sector” variables, space and time, are general to all concrete empirical phenomena whatever. *P*, merely the *number* of people, does not structurally distinguish human populations from any other, even the “population” in molecules of a gas. Then everything else, everything which is distinctive to the structure of human *social* systems which, after all, are the subject-matter of Dodd’s studies, is thrown into a *single* residual category, “characteristics” (1). This includes literally *anything* which can, in the logical sense, “modify” a person, the relationships of persons, their behavior, or any aggregate of persons. Any specific differentiation, classification or structuring of the characteristics of people is, with a few exceptions such as those to be mentioned presently, left to the *ad hoc* consideration of the particular empirical situation as it is studied. On this basis it is clearly impossible to build up a generalized description of a determinate class of empirical systems.

Consider the analogy: In a sense somewhat comparable to Dodd’s *P*, the unit of a system in classical mechanics is the “particle.” Time and space surely need to be treated explicitly in the system. Also to know the number of particles is essential. But then, in describing a “state of the system,” the student of mechanics would, according to the logic of S-theory, proceed to determine every possible observable characteristic of every particle, and of the relations and aggregates of particles. These would be the “data”—the more of them the more adequate—for the solution of the dynamic problems of mechanics. But surely Dodd must be aware that the fruitfulness of the theory of mechanics has not been achieved by such a procedure, but has depended on the rigorous *selection* of those variables which are significant to the system, notably, besides location in space, mass, velocity, and direction of motion. Density, color, shape, and many other observable properties of particles are totally ignored. Without that rigorous selection of variables there would be no laws of mechanics. But Dodd literally gives us *no* basis whatever for the analogous selection in social systems, and hence offers no possibility of laying the foundations for the formulation of dynamic “social laws.”

Indeed, Dodd is apparently unaware of the difference between his level of “theory” and that of mechanics. Thus he introduces (p. 744) a series of propositions about “societal forces” which he regards as directly analogous to Newton’s three laws of motion. In the Newtonian system “motion” has a very specific meaning in relation to the structure of the empirical system. It can quite specifically be described as constituting a definite kind of change in the “state of the system.” But for “motion” Dodd substitutes in his statements, simply “change,” which he himself defines as “whatever changes the status of a population or its process.” This “whatever changes,”

including as it does reference to all conceivable characteristics, is not in any way analogous to motion in mechanics. In fact it has *no* determinate meaning in terms of any specific class of empirical systems.

As compared to the specific determinacy of a theoretical system, in a "language" you can say almost anything—almost, but not quite. Anyone with experience in translation knows that no two languages exactly correspond. Perhaps the bulk of Dodd's book is essentially a work of translation, the translation of propositions previously stated in other terms into the notation of S-theory. But it is not unusual for translators to introduce, for the most part, unconsciously, subtle biases of interpretation. How does Dodd translate current treatments of social structure into his language?

A long and complicated development of the static aspect of S-systems culminates in Chapter VII on "Interrelations." This, if anything, is the author's most generalized formulation in the field of social structure—or "societal" as he prefers to say. Here he proceeds to develop the subject in terms of an "interrelation matrix" which is graphically represented by an "interrelation surface" on a three-dimensional model. These are, therefore, *three* dimensions of structural interrelations of persons in society, which he refers to as "horizontal," "vertical" and "lateral," the analysis being built up in terms of the "social distance" scheme of Bogardus. Horizontal distance denotes varying degrees of "intimacy," vertical of superiority-inferiority, and lateral—he is not quite sure—probably mainly of "differentiation"—which of course is not a highly "precise" category. One wonders how, to take a rather elementary example, variations in kinship structure could be adequately analyzed in terms of this scheme.

Professor Dodd's scheme of interrelations shows in the book no evidence of being derived from a careful analysis of the structural data available for different social systems. It seems, rather, to be imposed by his language. It is necessary for him to find "dimensions" which can be represented by vectors. Their number need not, to be sure, be limited to three, but how much more convenient if they can be! In the literature of social anthropology, comparative law, and comparative institutional sociology, there is an immense amount of empirical material and structural analysis available for laying the foundations of a generalized static theory of social structure. Dodd ignores practically all of this, not because he presents evidence that it is not empirically sound or important, but because most of it is not well adapted to statement in his language. In its place he gives us what a thoroughly competent student of comparative social structure cannot but regard as a very primitive structural scheme, the adoption of which would throw away the fruits of an immense amount of work.

Perhaps an even more glaring example is the treatment of the "space" sector (Chapter VIII). Dodd quite rightly points out that "In societal data space is important only in its relation to human life." But then he proceeds to make the bald, totally unsupported assertion "This relation is usually expressed in the form of an explicit or implied ratio" (p. 453), and therefore confines his treatment to densities. But is the social significance of a home expressible as a ratio of persons to cubic space? Or is the significance of national boundaries expressible as a density? Again, there is no evidence that

this dictum is a result of the study of the structure of social systems in their relations to physical space. But it is very convenient for the language of S-theory, and ratios lend themselves readily to statistical manipulation, while such things as symbolic significances do not.

Other examples could be cited but lack of space forbids. Dodd belongs to the group of admirers of the physical sciences who take considerable pride in their "tough-mindedness." Thus he speaks much of mathematics (with what justice the accompanying review by E. T. Bell may help to judge—eds.) of precision, of operational observation and verification. He is rather free in accusing his less mathematical colleagues of being vague, "literary," "speculative," etc. Yet on reflection about his book, one finds a curious impression crystallizing, that far from being notably "empirical" it is an extraordinarily "formalistic" piece of work. True, there are any number of facts cited. But they are not marshalled to throw light on any empirical problems of generalized theoretical significance. As far as empirical problems are concerned his facts might be chosen purely at random; there are no criteria of importance. The *only* selective principle seems to be the formal one; namely, their amenability to statement in S-theory notation. Their arrangement is that of the logical building up of the notational scheme itself, not of the structure of empirical systems, or of relevance to dynamic empirical problems.

Again, there is an extraordinary amount of definition. Most of what Dodd (erroneously, I believe) calls "equations" are not generalized theoretical propositions of numerical relationships, but are definitions, his translations of current terms into S-notation, in most cases without even a question of numerical equivalence of the two sides. There is, by contrast, a notable absence even of attempted dynamic analysis.

It may be suggested that it is above all the clear-cut orientation to the structure of empirical systems and to empirical problems of their functioning as a whole, which, in other theoretical works, provides the organizing focus for handling a complex body of material. Dodd conspicuously lacks any such focus. Its place apparently has to be taken by a purely formal standard of reference, the logical ramifications of his particular language. This is surely not empirical orientation in the meaning of the best traditions of science.

Dodd is very insistent on adhering to a certain kind of "mathematical" level of treatment, of which perhaps the best expression is his requirement that every concept and proposition be capable of adequate representation in vectorial geometry. To insist on this is to him a principal criterion of being truly scientific. But it remains an open question whether the structure of social systems can be adequately represented in this way, even if freed of the limitations of three-dimensional rectilinear space. Perhaps the most important question is that of whether all values of variables can be treated as points on linear continua. The present evidence seems to be strongly against this being true.

But be that in the last analysis as it may: it may well be true that Dodd's starting points could conceivably lead eventually to the formulation of a genuinely dynamic theoretical system for social phenomena, it might even

be that it would prove to be the most generalized of all possible systems. But in its present form it is not a system at all and there is no indication in the book of how it could be developed into one, or even of awareness that this could be important. There should, however, be nothing but encouragement for anyone who wishes to try.

But it would be a tragedy if all sociologists should stampede onto Dodd's bandwagon and henceforth talk only the language of S-theory. For this language imposes certain formal requirements which, in the present state of sociological knowledge, make it compulsory to rule out of consideration precisely those aspects of the scientific knowledge of human social behavior where much more than the bare beginnings of a working theoretical system are already in existence and widespread use. This is most fully developed, in broad terms, in the structural-functional treatment of social systems. Its foundation lies in the generalized treatment of social structure which, in both sociological and anthropological quarters, has been making rapid strides toward systematic unification. The integration of this scheme with analysis of motivation in socially defined situations in the work of such authors as W. I. Thomas, Malinowski, Margaret Mead, and various other sociologists, anthropologists and psychoanalysts, has already made very important beginnings toward systematizing the dynamic aspects of the theory of the behavior of social systems.

Surely one of the most remarkable things about Dodd's book is his persistent ignoring of the work that has already been done in the field of systematic social theory. He explicitly claims, as quoted above, that his S-theory is "better than any other sociological system offered to date." But his index of authors, while liberally sprinkled with references to Eubank, does not contain a single reference to Marx, Pareto, Durkheim, Max Weber, Freud, W. I. Thomas, or Malinowski. To be sure, none of these writers thought in terms that are easily translatable into the notation of S-theory. But some of us have been brought up to believe that usefulness in solving significant problems, not conformity with a formal system of notation, was the principal criterion of the scientific standing of a conceptual scheme. Dodd seems to have allowed his formalism to rule out even the elementary obligation to critical analysis of the work of those others over whom he sets his own claim to superiority.

TALCOTT PARSONS

Harvard University

Social Causation. By R. M. MACIVER. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1942. Pp. 414. \$3.50.

The central theme of *Social Causation* is the dual proposition that (1) causation as such, whether in the physico-biological or the social realm, is something more than "mere" correlation and observed "regular sequence," and (2) that causation in the social realm is different from causation in the physical realm because of the presence of subjective factors. Building on this foundation, MacIver endeavors to chart a useable method of discovering causal relationship which will steer a middle ground between the free

and easy analysts who attribute causal relationship every time they see a correlation, and the nihilists who think causal explanations futile because all things in the world are so interrelated that it is impossible to isolate any single factor from the web as the cause of anything else.

Causation to MacIver means that one event "necessarily follows" another, that "one determines the other." He cannot agree with David Hume, Bertrand Russell, and the mathematical school of sociologists who contend that causation can scientifically mean only a statement of "uniformity of succession," or a correlation formula, and that the statement that "one thing *makes* another happen" is "a remnant of primitive animism." The student of social causation must go beyond "mere" correlation tables and search for a necessary link between events. Unfortunately MacIver fails to define many crucial terms—"consequence," "determine," "necessity," "bound to"—and thus places himself in the position of using them in his discussion and then tacitly assuming that his meaning is the only possible meaning. A classic example is his question-begging refutation of Hume: "If Hume convinced me that he was right . . . he would have proved himself wrong, since it was his reasoning that *caused* me to change my mind (*italics ours*)."

Though MacIver maintains that causation is correlation plus something more, he fails to tell what the something is, save implicitly by reference to the feeling people have when they think of one event's "causing" another. He fails to disclose how in a given case he determines whether "causation" is really present or whether there is merely correlation. It may be suspected that when he states that two factors are correlated, but are not cause and effect, what he really must mean is that if we extended our experimentation and our number of cases, we would find an experimental situation in which correlated factor X was not linked to correlated factor C. For example, many medical men contend that correlation between smoking and shorter life does not indicate causation, both being symptoms of certain nervous instability. For practical purposes what they mean is that if, experimentally, we were able to force a group of persons who had smoked for several years to break off permanently, they would live no longer than their fellows who kept on smoking. That is, the correlation between smoking and shorter life would break down. When we have a sort of "intuitive feeling" that causation is not present in a case of correlation, presumably all we mean is that our experience leads us to believe that under different conditions X would not accompany C, and that if certain further cases were included in our correlation analysis, the high correlation would cease to exist.

At any rate, MacIver fails to convincingly demonstrate the nature of the "something more" which would place causation halfway between the subjective feeling of "something pushing something else," and a mere statement of observed concomitant variation. Nor does he clarify his discussion by repeated appeals to "common sense" to reveal the hidden link: "Everybody knows what causality means"; "Our experience as dynamic beings progressively confirms the reality of causation"; "The concept of causation . . . is derived from the primary experience of living in an environ-

ment." Presumably everyone also "knows" that the sun rotates about the earth, but it is fortunate for science that the Ptolemaic universe is not evaluated on such "common sense" grounds.

MacIver seems to find his firmest ground in his discussion of general methods of analyzing social causation—what he calls the quest for "the specific Why." The kind of thing the scientist must attempt is, for example, to analyze "a relationship between the eating of a poisoned dish and the death of the eater which is certainly significant and which we wish to examine without dragging in the whole universe." (We know, for example, that had the individual stayed out all night and slept through breakfast, he presumably would not have died, but we do not admit failure to spend the night out as a pertinent cause of the demise.) Practical considerations tell us that the normal activities of eating do not ordinarily cause death, that the intrusion of the poisoned dish was followed by death, and we examine the role of the "precipitant" which has disturbed the normal routine. We accumulate data on cases where poisoned dishes were eaten, and on cases where the total situation was the same, save for the poisoned food, and note the respective results. We have then established a correlation, which in either the physical or the social sciences is a step toward disclosure of "the specific Why." The idea of the "precipitant" makes clear that when a trend changes or an unusual event takes place, for practical purposes we tend to seek for some intruding factor which has disturbed the normal equilibrium of affairs, and not to elaborate fruitlessly on the fact that everything that ever happened was in some sense a cause of the change. At the same time MacIver pertinently warns against carrying the idea of "equilibrium" and "precipitant" too far, for "equilibria do move," have change inherent in them as well as external to them, and the notion that change is always the result of the intrusion of an external factor into an assumedly static social equilibrium is a typically reactionary point of view.

Having demonstrated that we can, experimentally, isolate causes, MacIver then attacks those who toss causal relationships around too freely. He is quite correct in stating that there are too many people who ascribe "causation" lightly wherever some correlation may be found, and who fail to ask whether the correlated occurrences are really in "causal" relationship, i.e., practically, whether elimination of one from the social scene will result in eliminating the other, or whether injection of one into the picture will produce the other. MacIver also cautions the "great man" and "unusual event" school of historians, pointing out that every link is part of the causal chain, and that therefore no change in the course of history can be ascribed to an individual personality or to a fortuitous event without analyzing the total situation present at the time. This concept is fortified by such statements as that quoted from Frank Tannenbaum: "The criminal . . . is the product of the sum of our institutions." In effect, the social body is an organism, not a mechanism, no single factor operates save in a network of interrelationships, and therefore the concept of the single "precipitant" is a useful scientific device but one with limitations.

Aside from the nature of causation in general, as previously discussed, MacIver holds that causation in *social* relationships goes beyond "mere"

con-
me-
bei-
of
Th-
the-
ext-
this-
man-
spa-
cau-
in t-
tion-
than
T-
also
beyo-
them-
Is M-
mere-
May-
part,
expre-
the f-
tion,
tion a-
and a-
nomi-
econ-
the va-
he sta-
Bey-
exist a-
proble-
when
and b-
import-
torily
tics, v-
predic-
extent
vations
backgr-
How us-
tions, v-
social g-
various
can pre-

correlation for a special reason. Correlated factors in social realms become meaningful only when they enter "the dynamic experience of human beings" and generate social values. Here the author introduces the concept of "dynamic assessment," which is approximately equivalent to W. I. Thomas' "definition of the situation." No person can predict or explain the behavior of an individual or of a group merely on the basis of the existing external conditions. MacIver's treatment of the causes of divorce typifies this approach. Objective factors—economic independence of women, demands of urban residence, etc.—do not satisfactorily explain temporal or spatial variations in divorce rates. We must, therefore, cease searching for causation in objective factors and conclude that "divorce is more prevalent in those areas where the continuity of the family through several generations has less significance in the scheme of cultural values than formerly or than elsewhere."

This particular analysis, while a valid reproach to extreme objectivists, also illustrates the weaknesses of those who go to the other extreme and, beyond insisting that subjective factors are scientific data, tend to treat them as *privileged* data because of their prominence in individual feelings. Is MacIver's analysis, for example, a statement of causal relationship or a mere tautology, i.e., "families are unstable where they are unstable?" May the "cultural values" possibly be attributed to the actors, at least in part, *by the investigator* after observing the fact of divorce? Even if the actors express these values, may they be merely "explaining" their behavior after the fact? In the light of present psychological findings concerning motivation, how far can we trust the individual's subjective feeling that the valuation *caused* the divorce? What reason have we for believing that valuation and act should not rather be treated as *joint* results of certain socio-economic factors? Finally, even if valuation does intervene between socio-economic factors and the individual divorces, must one not first show why the valuation varies temporally and spatially, and thus is he not back where he started—with objective socio-economic factors?

Beyond the mere demonstration that social motives, goals, and values do exist as a unique element in that kind of causation called social, there is the problem of determining how important it is to take them into account when we are trying to explain social causation as a prelude to social control, and by what methods we are to weigh their causal influence if they are important. The life insurance actuary, for example, gets along satisfactorily in predicting to a fine hair line a certain element of population statistics, without any reference to individual "dynamic assessments." In predicting parole and marriage success we are justified in dealing to a large extent with objective background factors, and referring to subjective motivations only by inference, assuming that persons with similar objective backgrounds will react in approximately similar ways to similar situations. How useful, we may ask, is penetration into *individual* definitions of situations, when the aim of *social* science is generalization and prediction for social groups? Though we may be interested in knowing, for example, the various reasons why individuals commit crimes, for practical purposes we can predict the criminal trend for given populations or areas (or the birth

rate, divorce rate, suicide rate, illegitimacy rate), and even adjust for the intrusion of an army cantonment, a munitions plant, or a particular population element, without inquiring as to the particular individual motivations which objective factors may arouse in individuals. Given certain external conditions, the "dynamic assessments" of individuals may be interesting, but in predicting social behavior as social scientists we often act as though they did not exist.

The final problem raised by MacIver seems to be the question of how we are to make use of subjective factors if we can demonstrate that explanation, prediction, and social control are served by taking them explicitly into account. We can, through the methods of sympathetic introspection which he suggests, reconstruct the conscious experience and feeling tone of a person committing a divorce or a crime, and realize how important this experience is for him; but as scientists our question is not, how important the subjective experience is for him, but how important it is for the social scientist or the social planner who wishes to understand and control the behavior of people like him. From the practical standpoint, the crux of the problem of weighting subjective factors seems to be a question which MacIver never explicitly raises: To what extent are subjective attitudes toward, say, divorce or crime dependent upon the existence of certain external conditions, and to what extent may such attitudes and values be inserted through education or propaganda regardless of what is done with external conditions? To the extent that they may be inserted and operate to change behavior regardless of objective circumstances, we may consider subjective attitudes *causal*; but to the extent that they wither and die save as nourished in the fertile ground provided by a particularly advantageous set of socio-economic conditions, they may be considered as mere by-products.

The question cannot be answered, as MacIver seems prone to answer it, by weighting subjective factors *a priori* and assigning them to a privileged order simply because they are subjective. We cannot treat such factors as though they were air plants without roots in objective experience. We cannot take the causal importance which people ascribe to their own or other people's feelings at face value. In order to answer our question we must subject these data to the same scientific criteria and methods of correlation applicable to objective data. To weight, for example, the causal efficacy of anti-social or anti-familial attitudes on divorce and crime, we must use statistical techniques similar to those we use in correlating family income, educational experience, age at marriage, type of neighborhood, and the like. Otherwise such factors are no data for science, and statements of causal relationship based on them will remain in the precarious realm of "common sense explanations."

MacIver's book will be most valuable for persons who are prone to dismiss subjective factors lightly, and for those who will derive benefit from his discussion of the methods by which "the specific Why" may be disentangled from the web of social causation. Chapter Seven on "Cause as Incentive," and Chapter Eight on "Cause as Responsible Agent" contain very pertinent treatments of the problems of free will, of motives and drives

(in
sib
T
wh
on
Ive
vers
ject
give
serv
that
show

S

The
B
P
A
City
insti
live
these
speci
of ch
the t
Th
not in
To a
filiati
fulness
classe
lower
family
first v
is arbi
tion o
First
To tak
are re
upper-
lower-
are ar
tically
worked
bership
the oth
are pre

(including the Freudian libido) as causal agents, and of criminal responsibility.

The major single weakness of the book, and unfortunately one around which so much of the basic argument is built, is the tendency to fall back on "common sense" as scientific evidence. Despite its elaboration, MacIver's interpretation of causation ultimately winds up as a sophisticated version of what the man on the street thinks about it. Also, though subjective factors undoubtedly have great significance, too much weight is given to the way people "feel" about them. The cause of science is not served by repeated appeals to "general assent." It remains, beyond showing that subjective factors exist and are present in everybody's experience, to show how their weight in social causation can be scientifically measured.

DONALD W. CALHOUN

Sterling College

The Status System of a Modern Community, Yankee City Series, Volume II.

By W. LLOYD WARNER and PAUL S. LUNT. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942. Pp. xx+246. \$3.00.

According to the authors' preface, this second volume of the Yankee City Series "gives a detailed description and careful analysis of the social institutions of this community" and shows how the "New England subjects live a well-ordered existence according to a status system maintained by these several social institutions." The word "description" is here used in a special sense apparently, for approximately two-thirds of the book consists of charts and tables, and much of the rest is given over to explanations of the tabulations.

The basic problem to which the authors set themselves is to explain "the not inconsiderable variations in behavior among members of a given class." To accomplish this, the relationship between class membership and affiliation in the various "social structures" is examined. Obviously the usefulness of the procedure rests on the validity of the concept of the six social classes (upper-upper, lower-upper, upper-middle, lower-middle, upper-lower, lower-lower) and the seven social structures (association, clique, family, economic, school, church, political) defined for Yankee City in the first volume of the series. In the opinion of the reviewer, the class hierarchy is arbitrary and the structural list far from inclusive, but a critical examination of these fundamental assumptions lies outside the scope of this review. First the interrelations are charted for each social structure separately. To take the association as an example, nineteen class types of association are recognized, ranging from No. 1, which draws its members from the upper-upper class exclusively, to No. 19, whose members are all from the lower-lower class. By a chart in which these nineteen types of association are arranged across the top of the page and the six classes are listed vertically, a lateral distribution of class representation in associations is worked out. Fifty-four "positions" or different combinations of class membership in types of association are identified. This process is repeated for the other social structures. For instance, twenty-four class types of families are predicated and fifty family positions result. Finally, and this the authors

undoubtedly consider to be their most important achievement, a master chart is derived by the conversion of the structural positions of the several diagrams into a general system of positions. This is accomplished by superimposing, as it were, the seven charts pertaining to the social structures, and combining in a single unit any two or more of the class types which coincide. Thus the class types are reduced to thirty-four and the number of positions which result from their relation to the six classes is eighty-nine. By this means, claim the authors, they have been able to "dispense with the older class and structural analysis and depend entirely on the positional and relational system."

This transformation is announced on page 12. The remainder of the book is devoted to the eighty-nine positions and their interrelations and distributions. Consequently, the conversion is the heart of the matter and a fair criterion of the worth of the effort. Amazingly enough the authors do not attempt to justify the method. Indeed, it would be very difficult to justify, for it is as bald a bit of hocus-pocus as was ever dangled before the eyes of social scientists. The reduction of a much larger number of class types distributed throughout the social structures to thirty-four rests on the undeclared assumption of the equivalence to one another of class memberships in diverse social structures. Thus, for example, the affiliation of members of a specific class or combination of classes with a clique is considered the equivalent of their affiliation with an association, and an identification and merging takes place. This is a knotty psychological and interpretive problem but it is treated in a perfectly mechanical and mathematical manner, as though anything that *can* be done with figures is legitimate.

Since, by this dubious process of mathematical legerdemain and dehumanization, the resulting eighty-nine positions are detached from concrete structural reference, they are considered to pertain not to persons but to relationships. The positions are defined as statuses. These eighty-nine social positions or statuses are distributed throughout the class system, the first eleven among those of the upper-upper class, Positions 12 through 25 among the lower-upper class, etc. Since status in this system is a matter of relationships and not of personal identification, the position of an individual may shift (within limits) depending on his companions and on circumstances.

To illustrate we might glance at the chameleon-like adventures of Mr. X as described on pages 35-36. This denizen of Yankee City is overheard discussing lineages of old families with well-to-do friends. He joins some friends at a club for dinner and afterwards reads the New York papers. Still later he attends the meeting of a rather exclusive club. The next day he confers at his factory office with members of the managerial group and then goes into the shop to confer with some of the men about working conditions. In the afternoon he goes hunting with a few of his old high school friends. On Sunday he attends church and is treated with respect by the minister. This all sounds in character and is even understandable until we are asked to remember that Mr. X is playing Position 1 when he is discussing heredity, Position 3 when he is dining at the club, Position 2 when he is attending the club meeting and Position 11 when he is with his workers and at church

(I
wit
like
be
his
tail
He
C
set
upp
mic
wou
upp
tha
Car
wor
the
City
Alto
Is
for
stat
that
one-
stru
Mar
fessi
com
its r
repu
a de
econ
catic
and
statu
have
or ne
press
Yan
the c
in its
suad
Th
with
spirit
meth
Statu
sized

(It is that last and exposed position of the upper-upper class where relations with all other classes are possible). This reviewer does not know who is likely to be benefited or even impressed by this numerical tagging unless it be the lackwit who expected Mr. X to stimulate production by reciting his genealogy at his workmen, to eat his supper in his office, take his cock-tails in church, and shoot his high school friends instead of the ducks. Here, if ever, is the obvious made abstruse.

Or let us look in on the tea at Mrs. Breckenridge's house. The stage is set for drama and emotion, for lower-upper and upper-middle as well as upper-upper class members are present. If Mrs. French (No. 26 upper-middle) had read this book, she never would have come. Certainly she would have known better than to essay a remark while John Alton (No. 3 upper-upper) was talking about sailing ships. We are not surprised to learn that she is snubbed and drifts aimlessly about until she happens on Mrs. Camp, whose family is in Position 37 (also upper-middle) but who has worked herself up to Position 26 for this occasion. Before the tea is over the reader is likely to forget the deference due the low numbers of Yankee City and may itch to put Mrs. Breckenridge over his knee, and sink Mr. Alton's ship.

Is this picture of 17,000 people playing their 89 counters in a fevered game for superiority, deference, advantage, and prestige the whole story of status and institutions in Yankee City? Fortunately it can be demonstrated that the authors and their associates have been ingenious and zealous in a one-sided way. They have gathered abundant data concerning the formal structures which contribute most to status considerations in Yankee City. Many associations, for instance, bring together persons of the same professional or educational level and emphasize the values they have in common. The family is over-protective concerning the economic welfare of its members, it strives for the best possible marriages, it is jealous of its reputation, etc. Even the church represents an in-group among faiths; often a denomination or a church in a given district is associated with a definite economic level. Economic structures obviously lend themselves to stratification, etc. These are the formal arrangements that differentiate individuals and groups. By limiting investigations to these relationships, class and status distinctions are viewed in their most exaggerated form. The authors have completely neglected the powerful ferments and solvents that modify or neutralize formal status relations in American life—the influence of the press, the radio, the movie, the common American idiom. We need to see Yankee City at the park, the grocery store, and the ball game as well as at the club and with teacup in hand. The authors have caught Yankee City in its most cramped and formal pose and they are elaborately trying to persuade us that they are just candid camera enthusiasts.

The methods and emphasis of this book cannot be adequately understood without a biographical note on Professor W. Lloyd Warner, the guiding spirit of the Yankee City Series. Warner, we are told, developed these methods "during a three-year study of a Stone Age people in Australia." Status distinctions based on age, sex, and kinship are inordinately emphasized in Australian culture. The question is whether method should not

vary with problems and whether the problems of status analysis are not somewhat different in aboriginal Australia and in Yankee City. While he was in Australia Warner came under the influence of A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, a gifted scholar but a misplaced natural scientist. Radcliffe-Brown seeks to make sociology and anthropology "scientific" by emphasizing structure and formal relationships and purging the fields of psychological interests. The consequences of this association are registered throughout the volume.

In fact, so engrossed are the authors with matters of structure, method, and novel tabular formulations, that they completely forget their minimal task as defined by themselves. They began their book we remember, with the intention of explaining the "variations in behavior among members of a given class." Their method toward the solution of the problem was the utilization of the general positional system with its eighty-nine statuses. In theory persons behave differently because of the different status positions they occupy. But if a status position is a differentiating quality in regard to other statuses it must be a unifying quality for those of the identical status position. To prove this point and validate the positional theory it is necessary to demonstrate that occupants of a given position have a common mode of behavior and a similar outlook. This, which is to be proved, is assumed throughout the book and is inferred in scattered single sentences and individuals examples. But the only thoroughgoing analysis of a position is given in Appendix 1 where Position 26 is examined. We are told that occupants of Position 26 are, in varying proportions, members in associations, cliques, and family; they are sub-adults and adults, males and females; they are Catholics, Protestants, Jews, or without religion; they are native or ethnics. At the end of this statistical survey we are told, "We now have fairly exact information concerning the characteristics of the position. . . ." If we gain anything from such data it is an expectation of diverse attitudes and behavior from the individuals of the group, an expectation which challenges the assumption that there is a reason for putting these people in one pigeon-hole. What is the unity which Position 26 encompasses which differentiates it from 25 and 27? So far as proof in this book is concerned, the only justification is that it occupies a different place in the positional chart according to the mechanical criteria which have been applied. And this is a perfect circular argument. For all the tables and decimal points, we get no answer to the simple question with which we started. Have we not here the current saber-toothed tiger of social science? Either its teeth will be reduced to more normal size or it will be stuffed and placed beside other examples of over-exuberance in nature and culture.

Pages 59-74 are hopelessly out of order in the copy reviewed. This leads to a summary of the positions of the upper-lower class before those of the upper-middle class are treated. We can only hope that news of this disaster does not seep back to Yankee City.

MORRIS EDWARD OPLER

Claremont College

The Social Organization of the Western Apache. By GRENVILLE GOODWIN. The University of Chicago Publications in Anthropology, Ethnological Series. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942. Pp. xx+701. \$4.50.

This massive study, published posthumously, is the first attempt of a modern scholar to describe fully any appreciable part of the culture of the Western Apache. The author's task was a formidable one. Before the reservation period, the Western Apache controlled a large section of eastern Arizona, where they lived in five basic groups further divided into twenty bands. The very task of tracing the boundaries and interrelations of these territorial units and clarifying the terminological confusion which has grown up around them must have been a difficult one, but Goodwin has solved it in a manner that testifies to his patience and industry.

In 1850 the Western Apache were in an interesting phase of differentiation. Their groups were something less than tribes, something more than bands. Of the five groups (White Mountain, San Carlos, Cibicue, Northern Tonto, Southern Tonto) Goodwin knew the White Mountain best, the Northern Tonto least. Of the thirty-four informants he used, at least nineteen were of the White Mountain group; only one was a Northern Tonto. The Apaches with whom he apparently worked most and whom he cites most often (Neil Buck, Frances Drake, Anna Price, John Rope, and Palmer Valor) are all of the White Mountain group. Therefore, further research may add variation to the picture. But it can be assumed that the author had enough contact with all units so that the core of what he has given us will remain essentially unchanged.

As described by Goodwin, the Western Apache were organized into territorial units of graded sizes—group, band, and local group. Strong maternal exogamic clans existed and these tended to be localized. Clans were linked with others in loose phratic arrangements and were of considerable importance in inheritance, chieftainship, and feuds. Particular clans could use distinguishing insignia and were said to be related to certain plants and animals. Goodwin sees the example of the Western Pueblos and the growth of an agricultural complex as the prime factors in the development of the clan system. Behavior patterns toward kin are marked by great restraint between siblings of opposite sex and joking relations between distant cross-cousins. There is a tendency to marry distant cross-cousins (paternal for the man, maternal for the woman) or cross-cousins by clan. Residence after marriage is normally matrilocal, a mother and her daughters forming a nucleus around which a cluster of households, the extended family, grows. These Apache permit polygyny and practice the sororate and levirate. The married man has a long list of avoidance, polite speech, and economic obligations toward various of his wife's kin. There are a great many other extremely interesting institutions and usages fully described in the body of the volume.

This book differs from the usually analysis of Indian life in two main particulars. The first is the magnificent use of source material. The details are illuminated by literally hundreds of direct quotations from informants.

These create an atmosphere and carry a conviction that no mere recital by a white observer could equal. They make one who has been among the Apache nostalgic for the sights and sounds they recapture. Secondly, there is Grenville Goodwin's own attitude toward his work and toward his subjects. He went among the Western Apache sincerely and respectfully, to learn. His was a manner and temper that inspired confidence. He came away with a sympathetic understanding of Apache ways which is always fair without ever being sentimental. He would have been happy to know that he has communicated that understanding to us.

MORRIS EDWARD OPLER

Claremont Colleges

An Apache Life-Way. By MORRIS EDWARD OPLER. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1941. Pp. xiii + 500. \$5.00.

The book is a tentative synthesis of Chiricahua culture as actively experienced by its participants in the dynamic processes of their lives. It is full of sociologically significant material. We take the reliability of this material for granted. Its organization, however, raises important methodological problems and is perhaps representative of a transitory stage in the evolution of ethnological systematization.

The author is obviously aware that the only way to achieve an objective and scientifically valid description of a culture is to reconstruct in accordance with standardized techniques of humanistic observation the active experiences of the people who maintain it in existence. He carefully refrains from such subjective judgments as are apt to result whenever an investigator substitutes his own experiences and attitudes as an outsider for those of the participants—whether these experiences and attitudes of his be emotional responses and practical prejudices, as among the travelers and missionaries of the olden days, or sensory apperceptions and dogmatic assumptions, as among behavioristic and ecological doctrinaires of the present day.

However, such objective descriptions of a culture present considerable difficulties when it comes to a systematization of the data. These difficulties are not plainly manifest so long as a culture is subdivided into definite realms, each with a distinctive inner order of its own—language, religion, art, technique, economic structure, social organization—for then the experiences and actions of various participants apparently belonging within a given realm can be selected and the impersonal order of their relationships reconstructed. And whatever objections have been raised against the schematism of such subdivisions, the fact is that in every culture, preliterate or historical, there are impersonal, specialized, distinct systems and patterns which can and must be abstracted and investigated separately for purposes of scientific comparison, even if their classification may have to be revised from time to time. The subtitle of Opler's book, as well as the division of some of his chapters, implies this kind of abstraction, although his classification diverges somewhat from the traditional, as when warfare is classed with economic phenomena.

The chief and nowadays well-known difficulty is to reconstruct the connection between these specific systems and patterns, after having ab-

stracted, analyzed, and classified them. This does not mean that every culture has to be conceived as functionally integrated. Such a postulate is quite apt to prove in the long run a methodological fallacy. But there is no doubt that, in the concrete process of every participant's life, linguistic, intellectual, religious, aesthetic, technical, economic, and social systems continually become interrelated. Is there any dynamic order in such relationships, cutting across the static, structural order of these systems? The problem is familiar to biographers; but an individual's life history as a whole cannot be generalized. Thence attempts to construct composite pictures of the life-organization of "typical" participants. For instance, Werner Sombart supplemented his historical synthesis of capitalism by outlining the personal type of "The Bourgeois." Leon Gautier, after characterizing mediaeval knighthood as an institution, described a typical "round of life" of a knight. Some modern anthropologists make use of more recent psychological categories in tracing their personality types, but the general principle is the same.

Judging from his Preface, Opler intended to do something similar. "I have endeavored," he says, "to show how a person becomes a Chiricahua as well as to indicate what he does because he is a Chiricahua" (p. ix). But the wealth and diversity of his facts fortunately interfere with his intention. He never shows us "a Chiricahua," a typical representative of a logical class of personalities. We learn about girls and boys, old men and women, several classes of adult family members, members of local groups, of hunting groups, of warriors' groups, of play groups, and about singers, masked dancers, shamans, political leaders, and others. Perhaps the only concept which could be applied to all of them is that of "members of the tribe," "aware of the linguistic and cultural bonds which identify them as one people and which distinguish them from other groups of the region" (p. 462). But they lack even a tribal name to symbolize this concept, and the awareness of their common tribal membership does not seem to affect very much the lives of most of them.

Obviously, we need some heuristic conceptual framework for the comparative analysis and systematization of these partial and multiform biographical processes. Sociology provides such a framework in the theory of "social roles" developed by sociologists since Cooley. It is a pity that anthropologists make so little use of this theory; even those who, like Linton, have adopted the term neglect most of its heuristic implications. And yet it is just the thing anthropology needs for an exact scientific reconstruction of the dynamics of culture.

No individual can experience and exact more than a small part of the culture in which he shares; nor is his life-history ever fully integrated—any more than a culture is. As an individual performs different social roles in successive periods of his life or during the same period in different social circles, in each role a different fragment and aspect of the culture enters the range of his active experience; and every one of his roles combines with various roles of other participants who deal with different values or with the same values differently. Thus, even if a war-raid among the Chiricahua is meant to serve economic purposes, yet the author's own description sug-

gests that a man is a very different kind of person, with a different status and function while acting as a member of a raiding party from what he is later in his domestic circle when he uses the booty for the maintenance of the household. A medical ceremony has one kind of personal significance when viewed as a component of the role of a shaman in a circle of patients, and a very different kind when it becomes a part of the role of a sick person in a circle of potential healers. And every social role is a highly complex and organized social process, requiring for its complete analysis a well-developed sociological approach.

Of course, roles are also socially patterned and each pattern applies to many individual cases, which makes it unnecessary to study more than a few examples of each class, and Opler's materials indicate how many diverse classes of social roles exist in Chiricahua society. However grateful a sociologist must be for whatever he learns about such roles, he would like to learn much more about them or at least to know why he cannot. And it would be most illuminating to him if the author showed methodically what functional and causal relationships between various types of roles in this society have occurred, at least within the life-cycle of a grandparental generation (which is—and rightly so—the very period covered by Opler's research). It is true that a monograph which dealt with all these problems would probably fill three or four volumes instead of one and that no such comprehensive and systematic study of the dynamics of a culture has ever been made. But there is no harm in outlining an ideal. And since the book in question, with its realistic and strictly objective presentation of facts, shows a distinct advance over the semi-philosophic, semi-literary attempts to characterize the "essence" of cultures in terms of personality types, let us hope that this is a step toward the ideal.

FLORIAN ZNANIECKI

University of Illinois

The Haitian People. By JAMES G. LEYBURN. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941. Pp. 342. \$4.00.

Scholarly studies of any one of our southern neighbors are particularly opportune in the face of this world crisis and our government's efforts to foster better understanding between ourselves and our neighbors to the South. The organization of the Culture Relations Bureau in Washington several years ago attests to the fact that our government realizes that real understanding cannot be achieved solely through the media of economic and political channels.

This study of the Haitian people, along with the contributions of such men as Redfield and Herskovits in the Mexican and Caribbean areas, shows clearly the ineptness of attempting to generalize about Latin America as a whole, or, for that matter, about any one of these countries in particular. The reader may be sure that no study that purports to portray the "inside" of all of our southern neighbors within the compass of an average-size book does more than slightly nick the surface.

Owing to the exigencies of the present crisis the trained sociologist and anthropologist is able to make more than an academic contribution when he turns his attentions to our southern neighbors. He can work with subject matter that serves to give us better insight, and, thereby, possibly contribute his mite to the breaking down of inter-American ethnocentrism.

In his study of the Haitian people, Leyburn centers much of his attention on the examination of their social stratification. Four chapters (I, IV, V, XVI) deal almost exclusively with this topic; and the rest are directed, directly or indirectly, towards an understanding of it. According to the author, caste is the proper term for Haitian social stratification.

The small numbers of élite at the top are composed primarily, although not exclusively, of persons of color (a mixed White and Negro type), and particularly the light mulatto type. The masses are predominantly Negro. Pure Whites are conspicuous because of their paucity. The élite simulate French mannerisms, use the French language within their exclusive social circles (they are also familiar with the folk language, or creole), and are outwardly Catholic, although their religious sentiments not infrequently reach down into the folk religion (vodun or voodoo).

Social differentiation is not solely one of rank and function; it is also one of culture in which the élite affect French traits and the masses affect their African Negro heritage, qualified, of course, by considerable overlapping on both sides.

It is to be hoped that the author has destroyed once and for all the erroneous conception that Haitian folk religion (vodun) is an exotic, macabre set of mystical rites. Vodun as a folk religion is a fluid expression of Haitian folk sentiments—a blend of Catholic, African and natively improvised religious practices. Catholic influence on vodun seems to be increasing owing primarily to the increasing influence of the Catholic priests. To the Haitian masses, Catholicism and vodun are not mutually exclusive. Each serves its purpose without prejudice to the other.

Some sociologists would condemn the large number of pages that are devoted primarily to historical phenomena. But in the reviewer's opinion most of the historical data have explanatory value with reference to the wide variety of current topics that the author discusses, such as caste, religion, sex relations and home life, politics and economics, etc.

The bibliography is adequate and highly useful especially to those who are so situated as to make it difficult for them to collect primary and secondary references on Haiti. The tyro, however, should take care in the use of this material else he will be forced, for reasons that cannot be explained here, to accept uncritically a large amount of it.

In the opinion of the reviewer the approach in this book is essentially a historical and anthropologic one, and not, as the author states, "conceived along sociological lines" (p. 305). Nevertheless, it is a valuable substantive contribution to the knowledge of our Caribbean neighbors.

CHARLES ROGLER

University of Iowa

Secret Societies: A Cultural Study of Fraternalism in the United States. By NOEL P. GIST. Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri Studies, Vol. XV, No. 4, Oct. 1, 1940.

Fraternal societies have not received the sociological attention they merit in the United States. Not only their wealth and the numbers of brethren but their doctrines and activities and the obligations assumed by members makes fraternalism one of the significant cultural traits of our era. Gist has prepared an excellent handbook on an important subject and the challenging material he has gathered should stimulate other studies in this field.

The author's theoretical interest in his material is to show the similar patterning of secret societies no matter whether they principally implement patriotism, religion, benevolence, insurance, abstinence, or occupational interests. He discusses their symbolisms, their rituals, their handclasps and passwords, their origin legends, their activities and their control of members as instances of a cultural pattern, and his material shows clearly that the tendency toward such patterning, which is marked in primitive cultures, is conspicuous also in our heterogeneous Western civilization. Freemasonry, first in the field and introduced into the American colonies by 1730, no doubt was the great exemplar, and the approximately 800 different secret orders at the peak of fraternal popularity in 1925-1927 were no doubt indebted to Masonic arrangements. The secret societies became a great proliferating series of institutions each striving, as the author says "to be different, *but not too different*" (italics in the original).

The patterning of secret societies in the United States has other implications beyond those the author discusses. Not only do they share certain conventions among themselves but they incorporate the patterns of the American *status quo* and to do justice to this aspect non-secret societies would have to be discussed as well as secret societies, and the secret societies would have to be discussed in reference to whether they are strong in the South or the Midwest, in the rural areas or in the towns. This study of patterning is outside the author's intention but many facts become clear from his survey. Secret societies reflect overwhelmingly the acceptance of Christian ideology in America. This aspect, of course, derives from specific Masonic influences as well as from the American scene, but it could well be studied in relation to both. Such societies as the Elks, the Knights of Pythias, the Odd Fellows, the Woodmen are not limited to churchmen but they all require of their members belief in God; in this "the orders are virtually unanimous." The Bible usually lies open on the altar during ceremonies, the neophyte kisses the Bible as he concludes his ritual obligation, the initiatory rituals are most frequently dramatizations of Biblical tales.

The great development of fraternal societies featuring insurance is more specifically a reflection of American life. Freemasonry does not provide insurance, but since the Civil War great numbers of fraternal organizations have been organized for the primary purpose of providing economic protection for their members. This was very popular among persons of moderate income, and is a feature not only of the Independent Order of Fores-

ters, the Maccabees, Modern Woodmen of America, and the like, but also in fraternal societies of Negroes and of many immigrant groups. The fraternal societies have likewise sponsored recreation and sports in the traditional American manner. It is inevitable also that the pattern of American life should have been reflected in oaths to preserve "America for the Americans." The extreme instances of the Ku Klux Klan and the Black Legion are well known but other less notorious societies run to extreme forms of nationalism and maintain lobbies to influence legislative votes. Aliens and communists are named as enemies by such societies, but other enemies are also specified, sometimes along with these two and sometimes exclusively. Several Protestant secret societies reflect traditional apprehension of Catholic domination, usually stating their position as opposition to any church or organization "which might have for its object the union of church and state." Racism in the United States is likewise inevitably reflected in the fraternal organizations. Racial lines are tightly drawn. Sometimes the rules exclude individuals not belonging to the "Caucasian race," sometimes they add, as in the Loyal Order of Moose, "and those married to some one of any other than the Caucasian race." It is ironic that the Improved Order of Red Men with its sachems and its "braves," its "Great Spirit," its initiation of a "pale face" and its general glorification of American aboriginal life, specifically excludes an Indian from membership.

From Gist's material the close reciprocity between fraternal organizations and American cultural life is made abundantly clear, and further research along this line would be the more valuable in that the American attitudes and preoccupations incorporated in these societies are those current among the largely inarticulate population which forms the great bulk of Americans. In the hey-day of fraternalism in the middle '20's membership was certainly in excess of thirty millions and these millions created for themselves institutions which pleased them. Since 1927 membership has declined, in some large groups of societies by over 60%, in others by over 30%. Certainly much of the patterning of the societies relates to American culture of the first quarter of this century rather than to more recent developments, and it is not easy to foresee whether fraternalism in its present form will continue to play its earlier major role. Already the supreme chancellor of the Knights of Pythias has stated in his biennial report that "the day for all our fancy signs, salutations, pass words, and similar matters, has long since ceased to exist." Business men report that they are "too busy" for lodge meetings. An officer of the Royal League in Chicago says "A few years ago . . . members turned out in large numbers to stage a long funeral parade and an impressive burial. Now all this is changed." Homes for dependent members are in financial difficulties and some have closed. Orphanages are only half filled. Certain executives state frankly that their organizations would like to withdraw completely from benevolent activities. Their relief activities still accept earlier standards of "Christian giving" and include large expenditures for Thanksgiving and Christmas baskets, and florists' bills in the five figures for members' funerals. The Odd Fellows and their two subsidiary orders spent nearly a million dollars in 1938 "burying the dead."

It is probable that fraternalism as it existed earlier in American life will be forced increasingly to adjust to changed conditions. It is still however a living and vigorous institution and a detailed study of its functioning in selected American cities and towns would be richly rewarding. Fraternalism still has great repercussions on family life, and has had much to do with the relation between the sexes in many towns and cities. No one can doubt after Gist's admirable summary that our secret societies are a major unplowed field of American sociology.

RUTH BENEDICT

Columbia University

Desert Saints: The Mormon Frontier in Utah. By NELS ANDERSON. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942. Pp. xx+459. \$4.00.

When I opened this book and observed that it was published by the University of Chicago Press and written with the financial aid of two great foundations I hoped to find in it the book about Mormonism that should be done. I expected it to be a dispassionate and penetrating study of one of the most unusual chapters in American history. Though it is not that book by a long way, it is nevertheless one of the best books on the subject.

Anderson is a Mormon and it is possibly unreasonable to expect him to be dispassionate, though he may, as quite obviously in this case, try to be. It can perhaps be said that no expository book on this subject has been very scholarly or unbiased, no matter whether by Mormon or gentile. By Mormons the best book, in my opinion, is still the doctoral thesis of E. E. Ericksen; it is a dull but competent study of Mormon group life. By non-Mormons I know of no volume that can be taken very seriously.

Anderson's purpose in writing this book is not apparent to me. He gives the first chapters to a colorless and pedestrian retelling of seventy-odd years of Mormon history, and the last to a consideration of some aspects of the contemporary scene. These are by far the best and are the only ones that offer anything new. It is not clear why he gave most of his pages to a sketchy and unsatisfying resume of Mormon history. Perhaps he intended his book to be a kind of introduction of the subject for readers quite unfamiliar with the materials. As that sort of thing, as a textbook in first essentials, it does fairly well, though the reader should realize that Anderson has chosen to ignore or skip lightly over some of the most significant and unflattering episodes.

He can, of course, argue that he preferred not to touch on or to touch only briefly certain materials that have been in too many books sensationally treated; but if he sets out to tell a story he can hardly be excused in the omission of matters on which the evidence is abundant. From start to finish he plays down or buries in footnotes or refuses to dwell on most of the shameful chapters in Mormon history. That is his privilege as a Mormon but not his license as a scholar.

In regard to polygamy, for instance, he says: "Actually, the long struggle between the Mormons and their opponents, the Gentiles, was not primarily concerned with the polygamy issue. That was a good and high moral issue,

but behind it were more potent economic and political differences." The economic and political differences were among the chief causes of persecution only in the earlier years. From about 1860 until the Manifesto some thirty years later polygamy was the important issue and toward the end it was almost the only issue. If Mr. Anderson had read the many speeches on the floor of Congress he must have known that, but he chooses to follow the thesis of Bernard DeVoto who, for reasons possibly known to himself, has tried to thrust polygamy into the shadow of politics.

Anderson quotes with approval G. B. Shaw: "With them polygamy was not a sex issue. If it had been, the Latter-Day Saints would not have tolerated the practice for a moment. It was for them a political issue." Polygamy was not quite so simple as that. It was economic rather than political; but even more—and Anderson nowhere dwells on this very significant aspect of it—polygamy was tied up with the Mormon belief that in the next world the men with the greatest number of descendants will advance more rapidly toward godhood. It was perhaps solely for this reason that Brigham Young resented his barren wives. It is true, to be sure, that Mormons would not have tolerated polygamy if they had been forced to recognize the sensual element in it; and as a scholar Anderson could have appropriately touched on this evasion in his chapter, "Some Implications of Polygamy."

To declare that polygamy was "essentially a political expedient for speeding the rapid growth of Zion" is to dismiss it in its least unflattering terms. Such a categorical statement does not examine Joseph Smith's reasons for promulgating it (and unquestionably they were largely sensual), or the evolution in the attitude toward it between 1842 and, say, 1860. Anderson says, either naively or evasively, that the "objective of celestial marriage in the mind of Joseph Smith is not clear" but with Brigham "it was social purpose." That is true of Young and it is one of his chief claims to greatness.

Even more clumsily Anderson sidesteps other matters, notably blood atonement. He gives only a paragraph to this terrible barbarism in early Mormonism and that paragraph dodges. He says: "The idea got around that some sinners could be saved only by spilling their blood. As the idea spread, the story began to travel that men had been slain." Anderson must know that persons were slain; he must have read what the leaders of that time had to say of blood atonement and the bold encouragement they gave to it; and he certainly knows that even today the Church publishes a pamphlet on blood atonement that is so cruel and primitive in its doctrine that it is almost incredible. If Anderson had had my background—he was not, as I understand him, born into the faith—he would have known that even in this century Mormon childhoods have been full of Mormon lore, including shocking tales of blood atonement during the Reformation.

In his treatment of the Mountain Meadows Massacre he is again brief and evasive. He writes unfavorably only of one person involved, the scapegoat John D. Lee, and argues that Lee must have shared in the loot because in 1850 his property was valued at \$3000 and in 1860 (after the massacre) at \$49,500. "There was no way, except by miracle or loot, for any man to

gain that much property, since no man on the frontier of that region could gain wealth except by his own labor." Brigham Young and certain other leaders who died in wealth must have got it by miracle.

In his last four chapters Anderson makes a contribution to the subject. "Priesthood Government in Zion" is a good statement of a very complicated matter, and there is good stuff in "Economy of Faith and Plenty." "Some Implications of Polygamy" gives some enlightening statistics and excellent anecdotes but nowhere does it get down to the job of reviewing the implications. "The Mormon Way of Living" is excellent as far as it goes. Anderson is right in saying there *is* a Mormon way but his treatment of it lacks candor for me. That way is rapidly breaking down and certain tangibles abhorred by the Word of Wisdom are playing a dramatic part in the disintegration. So, too, are the great universities of the East. When I taught in the Mormon-dominated University of Utah it was a common lament of Church leaders that their children went to eastern schools and returned with atheistic notions. A considerable percentage of the missionaries sent over the world leave the church upon their return. Of the offspring of Brigham Young whom I know personally, there is today not a single one who is a Mormon.

I do not wish to give the impression that Anderson's book is not worthy of a serious reading—and particularly its copious footnotes. It is in most respects a satisfactory summary as far as it goes. If its author had been more scholar and less Mormon it would have gone a lot farther.

VARDIS FISHER

The Gentile Comes to Utah. By ROBERT JOSEPH DWYER. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University Press, 1941. Pp. x+270. \$2.00.

The author has ably accomplished his purpose to call attention "to the role played by that portion of the population of Utah which constituted the opposition to the dominant Church." Inasmuch as the study is a piece of straight historical research, it cannot be completely satisfactory to the sociologist except as a source of much previously unavailable material which can be used to round out the cultural history of Mormon society. As history, however, it has many merits, not the least of which are its exceptional readability, the success with which the author has preserved the time sequence of the whole while following several phases of the development separately, and the perspective he maintains: the religious aspect has been consistently relegated to the background where it belongs, and the intense economic and political struggle is given the principal emphasis.

A little more diligence on the author's part might have saved him a considerable error in his account of Governor Eli Murray's regime (p. 144): a Federal law did indeed deprive territorial governors of an absolute veto (U. S. Revised Statutes, 1875, sec. 1842), but the territories of Utah and Arizona were specifically excepted in a proviso inconspicuously inserted into an omnibus bill "to correct omissions" in the 1875 statutes, approved on Feb. 18, 1875 (U. S. Statutes at Large, 43rd Congress, 2nd Session, chap. 80). This proviso appeared in the second edition (1878) of the revised statutes cited above.

Mr. Dwyer should also have been aware of P. W. Tappan's Ph.D. thesis (University of Wisconsin, 1940) on the public opinion aspect of the Mormon-Gentile conflict during the same period.

J. E. HULETT, JR.

University of Illinois

Methodism and the Frontier. Indiana Proving Ground. By ELIZABETH K. NOTTINGHAM. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. vii+231. \$2.50.

Sociologists will find no new concepts in Elizabeth Nottingham's *Methodism and the Frontier*, but the volume makes quite good use of the formulations of F. M. Davenport, H. R. Niebuhr, and others, in interpreting the relationship between frontier life and religious phenomena. The author uses for her primary "proving ground" southeastern Indiana during the early decades of the nineteenth century. Quite a large part of the book is simply a historical account of Methodist activities in this area as illustrated by the work of a few itinerant preachers and early bishops.

The study becomes of more interest to sociologists in those sections which seek to *interpret* the relationship between frontier life and the religious developments. This interpretation is carried out by comparing Methodism's development in England, where there was practically no frontier influence, with its development on the Indiana frontier. The religion of this frontier section is also compared with religion in the more settled areas of the United States. The author also traces the gradual modification of primitive Methodism as the frontier was transformed into settled communities. In many of its phases, this change is an excellent example of the transformation from a sect type religious group to a church type, as Troeltsch has used those concepts. Indeed, from the sociological point of view, the author might well have made far more use of these concepts of Troeltsch and Weber, or some other conceptual apparatus, to sharpen her interpretation by putting it in relation to some well articulated theory. This is a continuing need if sociology is to be anything more than inadequate history.

The chapters on the tendency for schism to develop in the Methodist Church make good use—rather implicitly than explicitly—of the concepts which H. R. Niebuhr called "the social sources of denominationalism." This also becomes something of an explanatory principle in the discussion of revivalism on the frontier. While the author contributes nothing new to the explanation of revivalism, her interpretation of its functions and its decline in the area which she studied is psycho-sociologically sound.

J. MILTON YINGER

Ohio Wesleyan University

Millhands and Preachers. By LISTON POPE. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942. Pp. xvi+369. \$4.00.

The material presented in this book was gathered mainly while the author lived in Gaston county during 1938 and 1939. Mr. Pope is a native of North Carolina. The volume is a condensation of a doctoral dissertation at Yale University, which brought him the award of the John Addison Porter

prize for the year 1940. In his preface the author rather summarizes in the following paragraph:

The interaction of churches and cotton mills in Gaston county since 1880 has proceeded in three modes of institutional life. First of all, there have been reciprocal relations in growth, i.e., expansion, quantitative increase in salient respects, qualitative differentiation and proliferation within each type of institution as compared with the other. Secondly, restraining and regulatory procedures have been worked out between the two types of institution, illustrative of the perennial problem of social integration and control. Last of all, the mills and churches have gone through a severe crisis together, and in so doing revealed fundamental relationships to each other which are normally obscured. A fourth conceivable mode, institutional deterioration, is not yet clearly observable in this particular county.

Gaston county and the surrounding territory was originally settled mainly by Lutherans and Presbyterians. These denominations predominated when the textile industry was getting under way about 1880, but they did not take much part in promoting the industry nor did they make much effort to attract workers into their churches. The Methodist and Baptist denominations invaded the county and these two denominations are credited with promoting the industry and much of the volume has to do with the relationship of these denominations to the mills and the mills to the denominations. The Methodists emerge as the denomination that has been of most significance in promotion and control. Recently certain sects have invaded the county and have weaned away a considerable part of membership from the older established institutions. These sects will in time become institutionalized if history repeats itself. Perhaps the best chapter in this book is the one entitled "Patterns of Denominational Development: Churches and Sects." This chapter confirms the book by Ernest Troeltsch, *The Social Teachings of Christian Churches*.

The author fails to find much evidence that the churches have been active in promoting the social welfare of the millhands. The churches disclaim worldly problems as proper undertakings for them to consider. For instance, on child labor, typical of many other citations, the author states, "With respect to child labor, which has been unusually high in Gaston county throughout the history of the textile industry there, ministers and churches in the county have remained almost completely inert." He does show that denominations in general, outside of the county, have interested themselves in the labor problems of the textile industry.

In his postscript the author seems to back down a little and admit that there have been factors other than religious institutions which have shaped the economic affairs of Gaston County during the last sixty years:

Cotton mills exercised less influence over the churches at the outset than now. During the period as a whole, economic factors have more nearly shaped religious institutions than been shaped by them. Even so, the churches have been of tangible significance in the life of the mills, both in giving early impetus and in according subsequent support . . . Both indifference and irrelevance to economic affairs have been notable characteristics of their strategy. They have provided powerful sanctions for prevailing economic arrangements.

There is considerable fact behind *Millhands and Preachers*. A somewhat

similar volume could be written with any one of several hundred counties in the United States as the guinea pig. It need not necessarily be a textile mill county. This is just another volume on an age-old problem. The author has done a very good job on the thesis that he set out to develop. He may have been just a little biased, but he could easily have presented a much more severe indictment had he determined to do so.

S. H. HOBBS, JR.

University of North Carolina

The History of Quakerism. By ELBERT RUSSELL. New York: Macmillan Co., 1942. Pp. xxv + 586. \$3.00.

Elbert Russell's intent in writing this history of the Society of Friends was to supply a brief, well-balanced treatment of the "phases, periods and divisions" of Quakerism. In this he has succeeded well. The book is not only informative and well organized as a chronicle of events and leading personalities in Quaker history but also lucid and discerning in its interpretation of Friendly concepts and practices. Notable in this connection are the discussions of the "inner light," the meditative and contemplative approach to "reality," the articulation of individual and of corporate experience and action within the Society, and the bases for authority in religious experience which Friends recognize.

Quaker insistence upon the intimate and, at least potentially, integral penetration of spiritual insights into all conduct has carried Friends at one time or another into a wide variety of fields of social enterprise ranging from reform, relief, and war reconstruction, to ordinary business and, occasionally, to direct political action. Their history, accordingly, must be told in reference to many strands in the social history of England and America.

The book divides Quaker history into three major phases, each with well-marked and characteristic emphases in principles and practices. The first period, 1647-91, coincides with the active leadership of George Fox in the new movement; the second, a period predominately Quietist and later sectarian in character, extended from 1691 to the separation in America of the Hicksite and Orthodox branches in 1827; while the final period, begun under the ascendancy of Evangelical doctrine and opening into a "rational mysticism" balanced by active "social concerns," covers the period from 1827 to date.

Persecution during the Commonwealth and Stuart Restoration periods neither drove the Quaker movement inward nor led to its withdrawal from the world; rather it stimulated the Seekers, as first Quakers were called, to greater zeal in seeking "convincements" and to more sturdy non-conformity in accordance with their "leadings." Birthright membership, the discipline, the external tests for membership, and other earmarks of sectarianism came to the Society as the result of growing concern for the preservation of the "ancient" testimonies and practices; and they followed long after toleration had been won.

Intimately linked as is the Quaker peace testimony to George Fox's own experience in the English Civil wars, it is not surprising to find that major wars in American and European history have, in at least three in-

stances, provided the crises and crucibles in which the Society has lost and gained significant elements in its principles and sighted new directions for growth and activity.

Within the Society itself, the major crisis followed the appearance of a strong Evangelical bent which introduced into 19th century Quakerism a "pastoral" system, routinized "orders" or worship, a strong conviction of the ultimate and infallible authority of the Bible, and the necessity for "conversion." Strongest in mid-western America where the historic continuity of Quaker traditions was more readily broken, the Evangelical phase began to recede with the turn of the century along with the older Quietist tradition with its hostility to philosophy and science.

While sociologists interested in the Quaker applications of Christian charity as a sociological principle will find Auguste Jorns' *The Quakers as Pioneers in Social Work* or Lester M. Jones' *Quakers in Action* more helpful, Dean Russell's *History* comes as a welcome introduction to a group known for its experiments in new patterns of social adjustment.

One serious typographical error mars the book—the consistent reference both in the table of contents and in chapter headings to The Great Separation of "1927-1928" instead of 1827-1828.

ALLAN W. EISTER

Friends' Civilian Public Service
Baltimore, Maryland

The Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover, 1709-1712. Edited by LOUIS B. WRIGHT and MARION TINLING. Richmond, Virginia: The Dietz Press, 1941. Pp. xxx+622. \$5.00.

William Byrd of Westover, whose life extended from 1674 to 1744, is characterized by the editors of the segment of his diary now published as "the greatest gentleman of Virginia in his time." This characterization, while it may be a mild exaggeration, seems to have some justification: Byrd was certainly one of the wealthiest men of the colony in his time; he was owner of a number of plantations and numerous slaves, member of the Governor's Council and of the governing board of the College of William and Mary, and holder of various important offices in the colonial government. Having been educated in England in keeping with the best standards of the time, he was able to give intelligible expression in his diary to his experiences and the events of the period. His diaries, another segment of which is to be published presently, are among the few intimate documents of eighteenth-century Virginia history that have come down to us. In spite of the irritation the reader may feel because William Byrd did not record in his diary some of the things we would like to know (probably because they were from his standpoint too commonplace to need recording), this volume affords a vivid, if somewhat fragmentary, picture of life in Virginia in the early eighteenth century. The most important generalizations which it suggests to the reviewer are three. First, the economy of the time and place was essentially pecuniary, speculative, and very dependent upon the export market. Second, it does not seem to have been particularly profitable; Byrd's plantations may not have been even self-sustaining. Third, the events and experi-

ences recorded in his diary by one of the most prosperous and intelligent of the Virginia gentlemen of his day make it appear that the health of the population of the colony at the time, both White and Negro, was so bad that, by the norms of our own time, it would be appalling.

Though a certain monotony of style results from the fact that the volume consists entirely of rather brief daily entries, it is on the whole quite readable. The editors have supplied in an introduction a short account of Byrd's life, and there is an elaborate index which seems to be adequate.

FLOYD N. HOUSE

University of Virginia

What Democracy Meant to the Greeks. By W. R. AGARD. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1942. Pp. 278. \$3.00.

In the current flood of books on democracy, it is significant to find a work that from our twentieth century perspective assesses the values of Athenian proto-democracy in Western civilization. Here is the seed-bed of our modern liberties, and although the transplanted seed has produced abundant new varieties in a different soil and atmosphere, it is instructive to view its early growth.

Oscar Wilde once remarked that a man who tries to exhaust the subject usually ends by exhausting his hearers. There is no attempt in this volume to give a detailed analysis of Greek democracy—it is aimed at the general reader rather than the specialist, and in the author's words, "aims merely to study the human values that were sought and realized by Greek democracy, the chief problems that it faced, the measure of success and failure that resulted, the validity of the criticism of it by its own greatest thinkers" (p. ix).

The writer begins with a description of the ideal content of democracy, the importance of the individual, the reliance upon intelligence and goodwill in human nature, opportunity according to ability, the goal of community welfare, confidence in the consensus of popular judgment, free access to the facts and free discussion, decision by the majority, utilization of all special capacities, widespread participation of the entire community in fundamental activities like education and political action, recognition of similar rights and duties in other nations and peoples.

In his historical résumé of the evolving democracy of Athens from the Homeric age to the onslaught of the Romans, Agard, as might have been expected, stresses the qualities of the versatile Athenian extolled in Pericle's funeral oration, and the high level of education, artistic achievement and popular discussion. In essence he seems to defend even the practice of choosing officials by lot in view of the superior preparation for community participation afforded the average citizens and the fact that "if they failed to have the virtues of specialization they also avoided its vices" (p. 74). He does not side-step the institution of slavery but declares flatly that "it was certainly not the basis of the Athenian way of life" (p. 78), pointing out that slave treatment was so humane, on the whole, that there were no slave revolts of importance till 103 B.C. (p. 79).

Nor does he overlook the Hellenic contempt for the barbarian. Metics,

he tells us, were forbidden to vote primarily because the citizens were practical enough to keep the franchise restricted to a homogeneous group (p. 154), and the popular attitude toward the foreigner was "naive rather than arrogant" (p. 155). Socrates was not an enemy of the democracy that took his life for "he liked and associated with plain people too much for that" and "refused to be used as a tool by the Thirty when they held unconstitutional power" (p. 125). Although Socrates made stinging criticisms of the government policies, this does not mean that he rejected democracy as such. As for the negative appraisal of democracy by Plato and Aristotle, much of it is due to their own aristocratic background and training, and in Plato's case particularly to his disappointment over the death of Socrates and his impatience with the ever-shifting creeds of hedonists and Sophists among the masses. Both Plato and Aristotle conceived society in true aristocratic fashion by means of fixed and rigid categories and were out of sympathy with the Heraclitean flux of democratic instability; besides this they were suspicious of merchant and artisan influence in government.

On the darker side is the inequality of the sexes. "Here the argument against the Athenian claim to liberalism is a valid one" (p. 156). Although discrimination against women was less pronounced in the heroic age, it continued unabated after Hesiod, though the author finds evidence of its weakening in Euripides (pp. 158-159). The true Achilles' heel of Greek democracy, however, he rightly finds in imperialism and foreign policy from the Delian League to the hegemony of Macedon. What he fails to note in connection with the problem is the natural provincialism of the city-state, the narrow mold into which Hellenic political life was forced, and from which it did not free itself entirely until the heavy persuasion of the Roman legions made it unavoidable. Agard has some words of praise for the ill-fated Achaean League, that child born out of due time, and a kind of nostalgic regret that it came too late for lasting accomplishment.

For the most part, the author's sympathetic appreciation is such that objectivity is at least partly blunted, leaving the reader with a warm glow of approval tinged with regret rather than a deeper sense of the tragedy implicit in the first abortive attempt at democracy in the western world. A truly Greek moderation dominates the work—"on the one hand; yet on the other hand. . . ." This might be called a median-balance type of thought except that on the whole it is an apologia for the Hellenes. The sociologist will miss the linkage of democracy with the urban complex, the analysis of frustration in social-psychological terms as the Greeks pass from community to associative life and are faced with the inevitable conflict of values. He will miss, too, a vivid comparison and contrast of Athens with Sparta—the contrast that influenced Plato to break with the confusion and anarchy of Athens after it had rejected its own cultural heritage, and then merge his own philosophical insight with the stern authoritarian order of Lycurgus. This was only a symptom of the wider social disorganization but a portentous one.

When all is said and done, however, this volume will have special value for those who desire an introduction to Greek democracy that is sane and free from cant. Although the book lacks the pungency and mordant style

necessary for wide popular appeal, it has wearing qualities that compensate for lack of pyrotechnics, a cumulative force of skilfully marshalled evidence, quiet dignity and true Greek excellence. It is no small matter for an American democrat (upper or lower cased) to read Solon's words in our own era of extreme vertical mobility, "Often unjust men are rich and just men poor, but we will not exchange our virtue for their money, since excellence is a lasting thing, but wealth changes owners constantly."

R. A. SCHERMERHORN

Baldwin-Wallace College

Two-Way Passage. By LOUIS ADAMIC. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1941. Pp. 327. \$2.50.

An army of Americans ("ex-Europeans"), laden with the "know-how" of American democracy, return to Europe to teach the Europeans to minimize their differences and thus reduce their hoary prejudices. The instituting of such measures as a continental currency, abolition of passports, etc., makes for a new mobility, a new freedom. The method used in the creation of Czechoslovakia is expanded and elaborated to envelop all of Europe, with, say, Wendell Willkie holding the reins in Germany, William Knudsen in Denmark, Pecora in Italy, etc., etc. This is, in brief, Adamic's proposal which is designed to effect a democratic revolution in Europe which would "... set up a European Nation of Nations with widespread equalized welfare and opportunity. . . ."

To prepare the reader for acceptance of such a plan, Adamic devotes the first three-quarters of his book to an anecdotal survey of the estrangement of cultural minority groups in America, both among themselves, and between them and the "Old Americans." For those who have read Adamic's writings before, most of this will be familiar, particularly the elaboration of the theme set forth in his article entitled "30,000,000 New Americans," which appeared in the November, 1934, edition of *Harper's Magazine*. In this he indicated the need to instill in each immigrant a pride in his national heritage, thus to preclude demoralization through too rapid "Americanization." In *Two-Way Passage* Adamic adds to this, and his new points are three: (1) all Americans, not excluding the "old stock," identify themselves with some "old-country"; (2) this identification is intensified, and inter-group antagonism sponsored, by altercations between any of the "old-countries" in Europe; and (3) because of these facts, none of us can be just "plain Americans" as long as the European squabbles recur to exaggerate the separateness of American minority groups. The attainment of what Adamic terms "unity within diversity," a concept not unlike that of the symphonic "cultural pluralism" of Brown, Roucek, *et alii*, is contingent upon a peaceful Europe.

Obviously the book presents a wide target, and the points selected for critical comment are not meant to be exhaustive. On the one hand, this book can be recommended as an antidote for the drivel of the Coughlinites, the Winrods, the Pelleys, and alien-baiters in general. Also, Adamic provides documentary evidence of the solidifying effects on minorities of antagonism and persecution, a fact all too often overlooked by the ardent

assimilationists. On the other side of the ledger is the fact that the author errs in his emphasis upon the identification of all Americans with some "old-country." Furthermore, Adamic has never made any attempt, here or in other writings, to differentiate between those behavior patterns which are compatible with his "unity within diversity" theme and those patterns which are logically irreconcilable, and which therefore preclude any "unity." Finally, as a solution to the minority antipathies in the United States, and to the time-honored animosities of Europe, Adamic's suggestions certainly are unrealistic, and sociologically naive.

RICHARD DEWEY

Butler University

The Foundations of Nativism in American Textbooks, 1783-1860. By SISTER MARIE LEONORE FELL. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1941. Pp. viii + 259.

This Ph.D. dissertation is a veritable storehouse of material on such sociological and socio-psychological topics as "hatred of the stranger," compathy (emotional solidarity), intolerance, racialism, "ressentiment" (as interpreted by Nietzsche in *The Genealogy of Morals*, 1887), cant, etc. Not a few of the many quotations from American schoolbooks of the past, contained in this study, sound as if taken from present-day Nazi publications. Contrary to its title, the study deals more extensively with anti-Catholic than with anti-foreign trends in American texts, though it is to be admitted that hostility to immigrants is not unfrequently coupled with enmity and animosity toward "foreign-controlled" beliefs and believers.

The tenor of this otherwise careful book is slightly apologetic, while the analysis of its rich material has been somewhat neglected. The author is not so much concerned with the historical truth or untruth of the accusations which she discovered in and excerpted from a thousand readers, histories and geographies, as with their apparent anti-Catholic and anti-foreign purpose. She rightly draws attention to the fact that many of our textbook writers have made no attempt to understand the culture and Catholic background of the Latin or Hispanic-American peoples, "the result of which we are today discovering to the chagrin of those who now look upon the Central and South American countries as economic assets and who seek to gain their aid through neighborly Pan-Americanism" (p. 226).

Part of the material presented has some bearing on the interesting problem of the historical relationship between the sectarian concept of religious freedom and the democratic concept of political freedom (cf. G. Jellinek, R. Redslob), as well as on the problem of the relationship between Puritanism and capitalism (cf. Max Weber).

FRANZ H. MUELLER

College of St. Thomas

The Internment of Aliens. By F. LAFITTE. New York: Penguin Books, Inc., 1941. Pp. 256. \$0.25.

This book by the adopted son of the late Havelock Ellis describes the treatment of German and Austrian refugees in England from the outbreak

of the war until August, 1940. "As a history this book tells a lamentable story of muddle and stupidity," the author announces on the first page. Addressing the House of Lords on August 6, 1940, the Bishop of Chichester said: "I have no doubt whatever that the first step towards maintaining the morale of refugees from Germany and Austria, refugees from Nazi oppression, is not to speak to the world in general terms about ideals of freedom, but to convince them that you will do justice." A spontaneous outburst of public indignation in the House of Commons in which members of all parties joined forced the government to make concessions, and censured the anti-alien press campaign. The democratic decency of British war-time life showed itself in the frankness with which the representatives of the people corrected the failures of the Chamberlain government.

On July 19, Mr. Peake, addressing the House of Commons, said: "Practically all the [German and Austrian] aliens who have come to this country in the last five or six years have been sponsored either by a refugee organization or by private individuals. . . . Apart from that vouching of character by the organization or the individual, there was then an examination by the British Consul abroad of the *bona fides* of the individuals who wished to come. Then there was a scrutiny by the immigration officer when the alien came into this country. After landing, the alien had to report and register with the local police, and since the outbreak of war every alien has been before a tribunal of some kind or another; many of them have been before two tribunals. . . . I can only say, on behalf of the Home Secretary and myself, that I wish we knew half as much about many of the neutral aliens and many British subjects as we know about the enemy aliens now in this country."

These tribunals examined 73,400 "enemy aliens" and at least 64,200 were put in Class C (entirely free). There was, however, no consistency in placing aliens in Class B (subject to restrictions of liberty); several tribunals adopted the practice of placing all domestic servants in this class, others put all unemployed refugees or all those living in refugee hotels in the same class. No organization was consulted by the government before the mass internment. The official explanations of the reversal of policy as due to the experience of Holland and Belgium are all based on false analogies (pp. 161-164). The government could not shift its responsibilities for leadership by simply referring to articles of a certain press. "Norway and France did not succumb, like Holland, to exported Nazis, but to internal treachery largely organized by influential men—officers, politicians, industrialists, financiers—belonging very often to the 'best' families in the land" (p. 174). "Was not the entire refugee agitation to some extent a method of strengthening our native British Fifth Column whom the Nazis are trying to use?" (p. 158). It is enlightening to read the story of the scandal of the "Arandora Star" which deals with the deplorable conditions of internment and of deportation.

The common sense of the British public was quick to realize that the "privilege of asylum" cannot be dissociated from the traditional civil rights of a British citizen (p. 181). The tolerance of minorities has always been completely accepted in England, and each person must be judged indi-

vidually, irrespective of language or birthplace, on the basis of his past record and present conduct.

GOTTFRIED SALOMON

New School for Social Research

Prisoners of War. By CLARENCE RICHARD JOHNSON. Los Angeles: The University of Southern California Press, 1941. Pp. 40.

This brief study of less than forty pages is a beginning in a field which should be scientifically observed. Unfortunately, military rules do not facilitate such research, so that this pioneer attempt treats of prisoners in the first World War only. The data were secured through the experiences of the author in the prison camps, by reading some fifty autobiographies and diaries of prisoners written much later, and by supplementary questionnaires from "nearly sixty" others. Since there were approximately six million prisoners in the last War, this sample is obviously small.

The data are organized under two main headings: origins of conflict between members of the dominant groups and members of the prisoner groups, and origins of accommodation. Many important factors are described such as: personal attitudes, loss of status, diverse culture patterns, relaxing of censorship, diminishing national egoism, and attitudes of the prisoners towards the dominant group and vice versa.

One of the greatest shortcomings of the present study is that no attempt has been made to estimate the relative frequency or importance of any of the factors described. One does not know which are the most prevalent and which are isolated and exceptional.

Many other factors might have been included. For example, the personal characteristics of the prisoner who happens to be camp leader and the reactions and interactions which his particular personality makes in relation to the personal characteristics and reactions of the Commandant in charge of the camp. Then there is the question of the frequency of news from home and the degree to which anxiety about relatives and friends influences day by day behavior. Not enough attention is given in this thesis to psychiatric factors and neuroses. Prisoners who can forget their own egoistic impulses and lose themselves in group welfare activity seem to be the ones who resist the "toxins" of the prison camps. Cultural activities, classes, athletics, music, moving pictures, plays, and religious work also vitally affect the extent to which there is conflict or accommodation behind the barbed wires. What is the role of homosexuality? How far are efforts to escape a release mechanism for monotony?

In spite of the criticisms, this pioneer study is a real contribution to the sociology about the war complex. Sociology should be making exhaustive studies of just this kind, so as to aid the treatment and conditions in the prison camps in subsequent conflicts. Prisoners of war are not criminals but courageous soldiers whom the accidents of war have cast behind the barbed wire. They present an opportunity of bridging international culture barriers and promoting a cross-fertilization of cultures.

JEROME DAVIS

Toronto

